DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 149 317 CS 003 894

TITLE Current Practices in Reading Education: A Report and Summary Tables from the 1975-76 Survey of Reading Instruction in New York State.

INSTITUTION New York State Education Dept., Albany. Bureau of Reading Education.; New York State Education Dept., Albany. Bureau of Statistical Services.

PUB DATE 77
NOTE 101p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Basic Reading; Class Size; *Developmental Reading; Inservice Education; Questionnaires; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Materials; *Reading Programs; *Reading Research; *Remedial Reading Programs; State Surveys; Supplementary Reading Materials
IDENTIFIERS New York

ABSTRACT

Responses to a questionnaire sent to 768 public school districts in the state of New York form the basis of this report on current practices in reading education. Each district was asked to define the terms "developmental," "corrective," and "remedial," and to comment on the availability of programs that fit each of the definitions. Information pertaining to in-service education, individual class size, and the use of the basal reader was also collected and analyzed. The study includes discussion on the use of supplementary materials and multimedia, as well as evaluations of auxiliary services and administration responsibility. Statistical tables and survey instruments used in the study accompany the report. (MAI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED149317

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Current Practices in Reading Education

A Report and Summary Tables from the 1975–76 Survey of Reading Instruction In New York State

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

New York State
Education Department

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Prepared by The University of the State of New York
The State Education Department
Bureau of Reading Education
in conjunction with
Bureau of Statistical Services

1977
Albany, New York 12234

CS003894

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Regents of The University *(with years when terms expire)*

1981 THEODORE M. BLACK, A.B., Litt.D., LL.D., Pd.D., D.C.L., L.H.D. *Chancellor* ---------- Sands Point

1987 CARL H. PFORZHEIMER, JR., A.B., M.B.A., D.C.S., H.H.D. *Vice Chancellor* ---------- Purchase

1978 ALEXANDER J. ALLAN, JR., LL.D., Litt.D. ---------- Troy

1986 KENNETH B. CLARK, A.B., M.S., Ph.D., LL.D., L.H.D., D.Sc. ---------- Hastings on Hudson

1983 HAROLD E. NEWCOMB, B.A. ---------- Owego

1988 WILLARD A. GENRICH, LL.B., L.H.D., LL.D. ---------- Buffalo

1982 EMLYN I. GRIFFITH, A.B., J.D. ---------- Rome

1983 MARY ALICE KENDALL, B.S. ---------- Irondequoit

1984 JORGE L. BATISTA, B.A., J.D., LL.D. ---------- Bronx

1982 LOUIS E. YAVNER, LL.B. ---------- New York

1979 LAURA B. CHODOS, B.A., M.A. ---------- Clifton Park

1980 MARTIN C. BARELL, B.A., I.A., LL.B. ---------- Kings Point

1981 JOSEPH R. BONGIORNO, B.S., M.D. ---------- Brooklyn

1984 LOUISE P. MATTEONI, B.A., M.A., Ph.D. ---------- Bayside

1981 J. EDWARD MEYER, B.A., LL.B. ---------- Chappaqua

President of The University and Commissioner of Education
GORDON M. AMBACH

Executive Deputy Commissioner of Education
_____

Acting Deputy Commissioner for Elementary, Secondary and Continuing Education
JOHN W. POLLEY

Acting Assistant Commissioner for Instructional Services
VIVIENNE N. ANDERSON

Acting Assistant Commissioner for General Education and Curricular Services
GORDON E. VAN HOOFT

Director, Division of Humanities and Arts Education
HELEN MATTHEWS

Chief, Bureau of Reading Education
JANE B. ALGOZZINE

Chief, Bureau of Statistical Services
JAMES J. BRADY

Contents

Introduction 1
Characteristics of Elementary Reading Programs 1
Availability of Developmental, Corrective, and Remedial Reading Programs 1
Class Size 2
Inservice Education for Reading Programs 2
Practices in Diagnosis 2
Table I—Inservice Education 3
Readiness Program 4
Table II—Initiation of Formal Reading Readiness Programs . 4
Approaches and Materials 5
Table III—Use of Basal Readers 6
Table IV—Basal Readers Used in Elementary Programs 7
Table V—Methods of Selecting Basal Readers 8
Table VI—Use of Supplementary Materials 9
Table VII—Use of Multimedia 9
Table VIII—Auxiliary Services 10
Administration and Supervision 10
Table IX—Administration and Supervision 11
Evaluation Practices 11
Table X—Instruments Used to Evaluate 12
Table XI—Sources of Mastery Testing 13
Summary of Elementary Practices 12
Reading in the Secondary School 13
Differentiation of Instruction 14
Assistance to Teachers 14
Appendix
A. The Survey Instrument 15
B. Table Summaries 25
C. Map of BOCES (Boards of Cooperative Educational Services) Regions 73

b. 4

Introduction

In December 1975, the Bureau of Statistical Services of the State Education Department sent a questionnaire to the State's 768 public school districts, including the 31 Community School Districts in New York City, to survey current practices in reading education. The information gleaned from the 726 districts (94.5 percent) responding serves as the basis for this report by the Bureau of Reading Education. A similar survey was conducted in 1969–70. Although the format was different, comparisons are made where possible for longitudinal study purposes. When feasible, the analysis demonstrates the relationship of the character and quality of reading instruction in New York State to *Reading: A Statement of Policy and Proposed Action, A Position Paper . . . No. 12 of a Series*, by the Regents of The University of the State of New York, State Education Department, first issued in 1971. Frequent reference is made to this 20-page pamphlet.

Mention of specific tests, materials or techniques in this report in no way reflects a Bureau of Reading Education recommendation as to their use. They are those commonly reported in use by New York State schools responding to this survey.

For the purpose of consistency in reporting, all information on the table summaries was organized by Boards of Cooperative Educational Services Regions, New York City decentralized school districts and the total State aggregates. It should be noted that summaries for New York City include data for the Community School Districts and special schools only. Data for regular high schools (Grades 10–12) are not included.

For purposes of the survey and this report, a district is considered using a particular practice at a grade level *if it is used in at least one class* at that grade level. Thus, a reported practice may be less pervasive in a district than it would appear. The survey instrument, table summaries and a map of BOCES regions as response areas are included in the appendix.

Characteristics of Elementary Reading Programs

Availability of Developmental, Corrective and Remedial Reading Programs

To collect accurate information about reading programs, the Bureau of Reading Education found it necessary to define the terms *developmental, corrective,* and *remedial* since these are variously interpreted in general usage. These terms, as adopted by authorities in reading education, avoid the confusion that can result in labeling all types of individual and small group supplementary instruction as "remedial reading." Respondents to the questionnaire were asked to apply the given definitions in interpreting and answering questions.

- *Developmental reading is defined as classroom instruction for pupils reading up to their potential capacity and progressing in accordance with their ability. Students having limited capacity and reading below grade level may be in developmental programs. Such students are not necessarily identified as corrective or remedial readers.*

The survey indicated that over 70 percent of the respondents begin the developmental programs at the prekindergarten and kindergarten levels. This practice is consistent with the Regents position paper on reading that states:

> **"Child development research indicates that the greatest growth in oral language and perceptual and motor-sensory skills occurs between the ages of three and seven. Since each child acquires these skills at a somewhat different rate, appropriately differentiated activities should be encouraged to assist each child to develop his full potential for beginning reading . . . . Many more kindergarteners are ready for reading activities once considered appropriate only in first grade. Many others, however, still require continued supportive activities to develop reading readiness. Effective kindergarten programs must provide appropriate tasks for both of these groups." (pp. 10, 11)**

Almost 96 percent of respondents reported that developmental programs exist in grades 1–6. Only 49.2 percent had programs in grades 7–12; 21.3 percent in grades 10–12, which suggests a lack of developmental reading instruction in the State's junior and senior high schools.

- *Corrective reading is defined as instruction for students reading below potential capacity who have no serious symptoms of neurological or emotional disability. If the student has the potential capacity to read at a higher level and is not doing so, he belongs in the corrective reading program. Corrective reading is characterized by small group instruction (5–8 students) under the direction of a special reading teacher.*

Survey results indicate that the schools of the State are in accord with the Regents' (p. 13) recommendation that: "Supplementary programs for students with the greatest needs must be continued and

strengthened." About 92 percent in grades 1–6 report corrective programs and almost 75 percent have programs in grades 7–9. Although the range of individual difference among students increases with schooling, only 39 percent of the respondents provide corrective programs in grades 10–12. It is also of note that almost 22 percent of the districts report corrective programs at the prekindergarten and kindergarten levels.

- *Remedial reading programs are for students with handicapping conditions which cause reading problems. Common causes can be traced to neurological impairment stemming from some type of brain damage, serious emotional disorders with many causative factors involved, and some types of physical disorders. Treatment may be based on a highly intensive specialized diagnosis and prescriptive teaching on a tutorial basis under the guidance of a reading clinician. This term is highly restrictive and applies only to clinical reading programs.*

It is worth observation that 9.4 percent report programs as "remedial" for prekindergarten and kindergarteners. Presumably these are related to developmental aspects of language and perception regarded as prerequisites for readiness to read.

One half of the responding schools reported remedial programs in grades 1–6, with the percentage dropping to 36 percent in grade 7.

Class Size

The median class size for developmental reading programs throughout the State is slightly over 25. In New York City, however, the class size (in 1975–76) was nearly 32. There is also a marked contrast in the size of corrective and remedial classes throughout the BOCES regions of the State as compared with New York City. The State median is 7.5 students for corrective and 3.9 students for remedial programs, while comparable New York class sizes are 13.1 and 11.8, respectively. Furthermore, according to the definition of remedial reading, if highly intensive and specialized tutorial teaching is necessary, true remedial instruction is rare throughout the State because the median class size is nearly 4 students statewide and almost 12 in New York City.

Inservice Education for Reading Programs

The reading position paper emphasizes the need for inservice training, especially in the diagnostic-prescriptive approach to reading instruction. It contains such statements as:

> **"Adoption of a diagnostic-prescriptive approach will necessitate careful training of new teachers and a massive retraining program for presently employed personnel, for its success depends on a wide knowledge of instructional methodology and of child learning psychology and the diagnostic function . . . It is primarily on the inservice retraining area that the Department will be asked to concentrate its attention." (p. 8)**
>
> **"However well designed the reading program may be, it will only have the required impact if it is managed by teachers who are adequately prepared in the theory and practice of reading education, and fully committed to the goal of educating every child in their classrooms." (p. 16)**
>
> **"The State will direct its major inservice education efforts at improving the quality of the teaching of reading in large urban areas." (p. 17)**
>
> **"Administrators at the local, regional, and State levels must create an administrative climate which encourages adoption of an effectively designed reading program in every school, and provide leadership and supportive services which ensure that, once adopted, the program is successful." (p. 18)**

Present findings indicate that schools of the State are responding to the need for inservice training. In the 1969–70 survey, 55 percent of the 605 reporting districts had inservice sessions. In 1975, nearly 83 percent of 726 districts had inservice programs. Highly significant is the fact that over 96 percent of New York City districts provided inservice training, reflecting the Regents' urgency for attention to urban areas.

Comparisons can also be made in other categories for inservice training between the two surveys.

Although not shown in table I, there is wide variation in the percentage of districts providing inservice training for paraprofessionals in upstate areas, ranging from 21–57 percent. Current figures also reflect attention to training of secondary teachers.

The Regents and the State Education Department have stressed the pivotal role of knowledgeable administrators. Significantly, 73 percent of the districts reporting held inservice programs for administrators.

In scheduling time for inservice training, nearly 69 percent reported after-school inservice sessions. Notable exceptions to this practice were districts in the Central and Mohawk regions and New York City which scheduled such activities during released time.

Practices in Diagnosis

The introduction to the position paper stresses the diagnostic-prescriptive approach as an essential response to the differences in learning rates and styles.

TABLE I

INSERVICE EDUCATION

Staff Participating	Percent of Districts Offering Programs		
	Total State		New York City
	1968	1975	1975
Administrators	N.Av.	73.0	77.8
Teachers:			
Elementary	N.Av.	78.1	92.6
Secondary	N.Av.	64.7	81.5
Total	66.2	N.Av.	N.Av.
Paraprofessionals	19.5	49.3	88.9
Reading Specialists	N.Av.	75.3	77.8
Special Services Staff	27.6	45.5	37.0
Other Staff	5.8	9.9	11.1

The survey explored diagnostic instruments and techniques used in the elementary reading program, the extent of their usage, and application of information gained. Both individual and group diagnostic measures were included in the questionnaire.

Of school districts statewide, 8.1 percent reported the use of individual IQ tests at pre-K level. Prekindergarten students in the Nassau region were more likely to have been screened since 18.2 percent or 10 districts, reported the use of such instruments.

At the kindergarten level, 50 percent of the school systems statewide provide individual IQ tests for some students. Of more than 240,000 pre-K and K students, 16,815 were given individual IQ tests related to diagnostic practices within their district pre-reading or readiness programs.

In Grade 1, the percentage of districts administering individual IQ tests to some if not all students rises to 60 percent and then to 76.3 percent and 77.8 percent, in grades 2–3 and 4–6. As might be expected because of existing testing policies, New York City districts test very few students. Only 5 of the 27 New York City districts reported using individual IQ tests as a diagnostic tool related to their reading program.

Readiness tests, as distinguished from IQ tests, are reported in 87.7 percent of the districts at the kindergarten level and in 66.8 percent at the first grade level. About three-quarters of districts statewide use readiness tests in kindergarten and first grade.

Group diagnostic tests are administered in 20 percent of the districts in kindergarten. At this level about 5 percent of the students were tested. The number tested increased for grades 1–3 with about one third of the students screened and at grades 4–6 where 37 percent are tested. Three-fourths of all districts responding used group diagnostic tests with a substantial number of students at each of these levels.

Teacher observation is commonly reported used for diagnostic purposes in the elementary school. This soft measure is supplemented by group test scores for about 33 percent of all students enrolled in grades 1-3 and 39 percent of all students, grades 4-6.

In addition to group testing, beginning at the kindergarten level, other individual diagnostic devices are used. More than three times as many kindergarten students were screened individually as group tested. Beyond kindergarten, nearly twice as many student reading skills were diagnosed through group tests as through individual screening.

Instruments to determine motor skills development, visual and auditory acuity, and language development were included. Motor skills tests were administered primarily at the K-1 levels. Districts report use of motor skills testing at kindergarten in 74.5 percent of the districts and in 63.2 percent at grade 1. Visual and auditory acuity is screened at K-6 levels in 90 percent of the districts responding. Appraisals of language development were reported for grades K-1 in about one half of the districts. Such screening tapers to 43 percent for grades 4-6. Language development screening is reported least frequently in the Mohawk BOCES region. The highest incidence of language development tests is reported by more than one-half of the districts in the Long Island regions, and Central and Lower Hudson where three-quarters of the school districts provide this testing.

Readiness Program

Educators in general agree that reading readiness is the developmental stage at which physical and environmental factors have prepared the child for reading instruction. It follows that readiness programs provide experiences to help a child mature and prepare for learning to read proficiently.

Survey results indicate a trend toward lowering the initiation of reading readiness activities from first graders to kindergarteners, a move which is in keeping with research findings explored in the position paper:

> **"Assessment of individual learning patterns and prescription of appropriate learning activities must begin long before the formal introduction of the child to printed materials . . . Reading-related activities should begin before the child enters school, ideally in the home.**
>
> **"Few homes, however, regardless of their socio-economic status, can offer full opportunity to develop a preschool child's learning potential. Therefore, individualized reading-related activities must be an integral part of the program in prekindergarten and day care centers as well as in the kindergarten. The largely untapped potential of early childhood programs**

TABLE II

INITIATION OF FORMAL READING READINESS PROGRAMS

IN NEW YORK STATE

School Year	Percent of New York State Public School Districts Initiating Reading Readiness Programs In:		
	Pre-K	K	Grade 1
1968-69	3	79	18
1975-76[a/]	3	88	8

[a/] Percents do not add to 100 because of "no responses" to questionnaire item.

for identifying individual learning needs and prescribing appropriate learning experiences must be developed, particularly in programs which serve the urban disadvantaged." (p. 10)

Statewide, formal reading readiness programs were introduced in 87.7 percent of the kindergartens in 1975–76, in contrast to 78.8 percent of the districts initiating readiness instruction at kindergarten levels in 1969–70.

In 1975–76, 8.1 percent of the schools were starting readiness programs in grade 1, but in the 1969–70 survey, 18.4 percent indicated that such instruction commenced in grade 1. In both surveys, only .02 percent of the school districts reported readiness activities at the pre-K level. There was an increase of 11 percent in the proportion of districts offering kindergarten formal readiness programs.

At the pre-K level, few districts report using reading readiness materials. Readiness materials in grades K–6 are reported used in the following percentages: readiness program accompanying basal reader, 89.1 percent; teacher-made materials, 77.8 percent; perceptual motor development, 75.2 percent; and language development kits, 69.1 percent.

Approaches and Materials

The position paper states without equivocation the Regents' stand on the appropriate method for teaching beginning reading:

> **"At the beginning of the reading program, and throughout the program, a variety of alternative instructional methods must be employed to assist each child in learning how to recognize and interpret the written word. The past decade of reading research indicates that there is no unique method which will guarantee that all children will learn to read with equal ease. It suggests that reading achievement varies more significantly within the population using any given method than between populations using different methods. Therefore, the reading program should not rely on a single method for all children, but should make use of alternative methods which meet the varying needs of individual children.**
>
> **"In learner-centered instruction, the age old controversy over the value of phonics or look-say as the most successful method for teaching word recognition gives way to selection of those methods to which the individual child responds most readily. If the child learns best through a phonic approach, this method is used. If he responds more readily to other methods—such as language experiences, linguistics, or visual approaches—these are used. After teaching initially to his strength, instructional approaches should be broadened until each child is equipped with a variety of strategies for recognizing and interpreting words." (p. 11)**

Data indicate that a phonics approach is used in teaching reading in 97.2 percent of the elementary programs. Phonics is used in BOCES regions in combination with linguistics (71.5 percent), language experience (85.4 percent), and programmed learning (58.4 percent). Of the New York City districts which reported, high percentages (phonics 96.3 percent, linguistics 96.3 percent, language experience 88.9 percent and programmed learning 66.7 percent) reflect that each of these approaches is used. It would appear, statewide, that phonics is used in combination with other approaches in a high percentage. This concurs with the Regents' recommendation that children use a variety of strategies in identifying unfamiliar words.

The Regents believe there should be varied materials including basal readers available for instruction. The paper states:

> **"Instructional materials must be varied to accommodate the great diversity of interests, abilities, needs, and experiences which children bring to the reading process. Traditionally, reading programs have relied on the use of a single basal reader series and its manuals and workbooks. Many of these materials are primarily designed for children in the midrange of ability, with predominantly middle-class, suburban, or rural backgrounds. Often the same instructional materials are used for all students in a given grade. Such programs make unrealistic demands of some students before they are able to meet them, fail to challenge the faster or more gifted learners, and lack relation to the interests and life styles of many children.**
>
> **"Student interests, needs, and abilities must be determining factors in the selection and preparation of materials for reading instruction. The teacher must be able to choose from a variety of materials those which best meet the needs of a particular reading situation." (p. 11)**

Although the survey statistics do not reveal the rationale for selection of instructional method, the fact that there are alternatives indicates that appropriate materials are available to support an individualized approach.

The questionnaire surveyed the basals most frequently used. The data obtained can in no way be interpreted to reflect a rationale for matching interests or needs with tests, nor do they determine other means for supplying continuity of skills. They do, however, give an indication of the basal readers used in significant numbers of the elementary schools.

Ranges of difference in basal reader preference exist

from region to region as this sample with percentages of districts using Ginn and Company, Houghton Mifflin, Macmillan, and Scott, Foresman indicates.

Little change has occurred in the use of basal readers since 1969-70. Scott, Foresman still leads the field but the percentage of reporting districts using Scott, Foresman has declined from 79.7 percent to 70.7 percent. Houghton Mifflin and Ginn and Company remain second and third without significant change. Macmillan has risen to fourth with 41.2 percent. Nearly half of the districts responding also use one or more of 28 readers other than those listed in the survey. However, none is used in any substantial percentage of districts in New York State.

No established preference for method of selection of readers has emerged from this survey. Of the districts, 31.7 percent indicated a preference for schoolwide selection of multibasals, with New York City skewing the profile by reporting that 88.9 percent of the districts have several basals chosen by each school. In the State, 26 percent of the districts select a single basal reader for districtwide use. In southern New York areas, 28.1 percent-43.9 percent of the districts select multibasals according to individual teacher preference or a gradewide selection is made. Upstate New York does not follow this prevalence, nor did any one selection procedure emerge as the most accepted. The tables indicate that in each school district a variety of basals are in use. This should enable a teacher to differentiate among texts according to student needs.

TABLE III

USE OF BASAL READERS

1975-76

Basal Series	Percent of Districts Reporting Use	
	New York State	New York City
Allyn and Bacon	21.8	70.4
American Book	36.0	92.6
Ginn and Company	57.3	92.6
Holt, Rinehart, and Winston	26.6	77.8
Houghton Mifflin Company	63.5	92.6
Lippincott	33.5	92.6
Macmillan	41.2	88.9
Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc.	28.8	81.5
Scott, Foresman and Company	70.7	88.9
Other basal readers[a/]	49.0	51.9

[a/] See appendix

TABLE IV

BASAL READERS USED IN ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using:							
	Ginn and Company		Houghton Mifflin Company		Macmillan		Scott, Foresman and Company	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	45	47.4	61	64.2	29	30.5	58	61.1
Central	27	56.3	33	68.8	21	43.8	31	64.6
Central Western	42	61.8	43	63.2	17	25.0	47	69.1
Lower Hudson	40	70.2	40	70.2	38	66.7	42	73.7
Mid-Hudson	32	72.7	20	45.5	21	47.7	33	75.0
Mohawk	13	32.5	25	62.5	14	35.0	28	70.0
Nassau	37	67.3	33	60.0	36	65.5	47	85.5
Northeast	18	62.1	19	65.5	3	10.3	20	69.0
Ontario	10	29.4	18	52.9	5	14.7	17	50.0
Southern Tier	34	45.3	49	65.3	15	20.0	53	70.7
Suffolk	40	62.5	44	68.8	36	56.3	50	78.1
Western	53	58.9	51	56.7	40	44.4	63	70.0
New York City	25	92.6	25	92.6	24	88.9	24	88.9
Total State	416	57.3	461	63.5	299	41.2	513	70.7

TABLE V

METHODS OF SELECTING BASAL READERS FOR ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS

1975-76

Method of Selecting Basal Readers	Number and Percent of Districts Reporting Use			
	New York State		New York City	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
District-wide Selection Of:				
Single Basal	189	26.0	0	0.0
Co-Basals	103	14.2	1	3.7
Multi-Basals	157	21.6	1	3.7
School-wide Selections Of:				
Single Basal	165	22.7	18	66.7
Co-Basals	115	15.8	14	51.9
Multi-Basals	230	31.7	24	88.9

A trend toward the increased use of multimedia supplementary materials has also occurred since the previous survey and the publication of the position paper, which recommended:

> **"In addition to appropriately varied materials for direct instruction, every classroom and library should have and display collections of reading materials which appeal to student's interests and are within the independent reading levels of those who will use them. Such multimedia materials as films, story filmstrips, and recordings should be included in these collections to stimulate involvement of children in the process of gathering information and cultivate their enjoyment of literature. The students must have appropriate time to use these materials, and the environment in every classroom and library must stimulate the desire to use them." (pp. 11-12)**

The use of supplementary texts and activity books, however, has remained at approximately the same levels during the years intervening between the two surveys.

The following table shows a trend toward increased use of multimedia materials which provides variety and enhances individualization of reading practices.

The Regents paper frequently refers to the need for support services to facilitate learning, (pp. 9, 12, and 13). The State survey determines that school districts are incorporating auxiliary services with reading programs.

The following table indicates that significant numbers of districts make use of psychological services, guidance, and speech services. Statewide, although

TABLE VI

USE OF SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS FOR ELEMENTARY READING PROGRAMS IN NEW YORK STATE

Type of Materials	Percent of Districts Reporting Use	
	1968-69	1975-76
Supplementary Texts	97.0	95.6
Supplementary Activity Workbooks and Worksheets	95.0	97.7

TABLE VII

USE OF MULTIMEDIA

Item	Percent of Districts:			
	New York State		New York City	
	1968-69	1975-76	1968-69	1975-76
Film Strips	94.5	94.8	97.6	92.6
Tapes	76.7	93.9	90.0	88.9
Laboratory Kits	81.5	89.3	90.0	92.6
Tachistoscopic Devices	58.9	72.0	64.1	72.8
Reading Pacers	42.2	62.3	52.9	74.1
Game Techniques	85.3	94.8	84.1	92.6
Muscular Coordination	55.0	62.3	64.1	55.6
Visual Perception Development	71.9	81.4	82.9	77.8

TABLE VIII

AUXILIARY SERVICES FOR ELEMENTARY READING PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Auxiliary Services	Number and Percent of Districts Providing Services			
	New York State		New York City	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Psychological Services	661	91.0	15	55.6
Guidance Services	439	60.5	22	81.5
Physical Education	458	63.1	5	18.5
Paraprofessional Services	568	78.2	25	92.6
Speech Services	627	86.4	19	70.4

not in New York City, physical education is contributing to reading improvement programs. Paraprofessional services continue to be included as a necessary component of reading programs.

Administration and Supervision

The Regents stressed the need for total commitment of the school administrator to ensure the success of the reading program. They have spelled out the administrative role in detail:

> **"Administrators at the local, regional, and State levels must create an administrative climate which encourages adoption of an effectively designed reading program in every school, and provide leadership and supportive services which ensure that, once adopted, the program is successful.**
>
> **"The local administrator must educate his staff and the public concerning the principles of an effective reading program. He must evaluate policies concerning such matters as school and classroom organization, to ensure that they facilitate effective reading instruction. He must provide adequate support systems for classroom teachers, including the services of a qualified reading specialist and materials necessary for individualized instruction. He should encourage classroom demonstration of effective practices and frequent interchange of information between staff members. He has a major responsibility for evaluating innovative programs and ensuring that successful program elements are incorporated into other programs. Finally, the local administrator must motivate his staff by his own personal involvement in efforts to improve reading achievement." (p. 18)**

Supervisory and administrative tasks are, however, delegated to other staff members. The recent survey reveals that such responsibilities are assigned as follows. The building principals assume task responsibility in 41.7 percent of the school districts surveyed. Reading directors and assistant superintendents or their counterparts fulfill an administrative/supervisory role in 18.2 percent and 12.4 percent of the districts respectively, with elementary coordinators functioning in a supervisory capacity in 10.2 percent of the surveyed schools. (Department heads and assistant principals are infrequently used in an administrative/supervisory

TABLE IX

RESPONSIBILITY FOR ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION OF THE ELEMENTARY READING PROGRAM

Position	Number and Percent of Districts Delegating Responsibility to Selected Positions in:			
	New York State		New York City	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Deputy, associate, or assistant superintendent for elementary education, curriculum, or instruction	90	12.4	5	18.5
Director or coordinator of elementary education, curriculum, or instruction	74	10.2	0	0.0
Principal	303	41.7	13	48.1
Reading director, coordinator, or supervisor	132	18.2	2	7.4

capacity.) Reading consultants or specialists are also infrequently required to fill a supervisory role, with about 5 percent of the districts using specialists in this manner. Overlapping of the responsibilities may occur, but this cannot be determined from the survey.

Evaluation Practices

In the position paper, the Regents made recommendations for evaluating student achievement and program effectiveness more thoroughly than in the past:

> **"The current system of evaluating reading achievement through standardized tests does not adequately measure individual reading proficiency, nor does it provide teachers of reading with the necessary information for determining individual reading needs and selecting appropriate instructional techniques and materials to meet these needs." (p. 15)**
>
> **"While normative standardized tests will continue to serve as useful measures for assessing and comparing the broad range of reading achievement within large populations, the great need is for an evaluation system which will enable teachers to accurately assess individual reading strengths and weaknesses, and to prescribe learning activities which meet each individual student's needs." (p. 15)**

On the 1969–70 survey, school districts responded to questions about the specific achievement tests they used. Averaging the returns, 31 percent of the districts indicated using reading achievement tests, while 12.3 percent were using reading survey tests at that time. By way of contrast, 95 percent are currently using achievement tests and 67.5 percent, reading survey tests. A significant increase in the use of standardized evaluation is apparent here.

The most commonly reported standardized reading

TABLE X

INSTRUMENTS USED TO EVALUATE THE ELEMENTARY READING PROGRAM

Instrument	Percent of Districts Using Selected Instruments During:	
	1968-69	1975-76
Mastery testing of selected objectives	N.Av.	51.2
Achievement tests	31.0	95.0
Reading survey tests	12.3	67.5
Other means	N.Av.	24.1

achievement tests are the Metropolitan Achievement Test, the Stanford Achievement Test, the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, and the California Achievement Test.

In addition to the mandated State reading tests, the Metropolitan Achievement Tests are used in 52.9 percent of the districts, Stanford Achievement in 42.6 percent and Iowa Tests of Basic Skills in 39 percent of districts reporting. While 32.1 percent reported usage of other tests, a review of these instruments did not pinpoint any one to a significant percentage of districts. It must be noted that many districts use several tests for different levels and/or reading programs so that percentages reporting use of an instrument should not be construed as indicating exclusive use in a district.

The Reading Survey Tests which were most often administered are the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests and the Developmental Reading Tests.

Evaluation systems are now provided to schools by a number of sources. The position paper describes the development of SPPED-CAM (System for Pupil and Program Evaluation and Development/Comprehensive Achievement Monitoring) for testing mastery of selected objectives:

> **"The new evaluation system is based on precise descriptions of the specific skills each individual must acquire to become a proficient reader. On the basis of these essential skills, a bank of learning objectives for reading education has been developed. These objectives will serve as guidelines for the content of the reading program, and as performance standards for determining when each student has mastered particular skills essential to reading proficiency.**
>
> **"The test items in the new evaluation system will contain tasks which measure the individual student's progress toward meeting instructional objectives. Unlike most items on normative standardized tests, these items will be matched to the specific objectives and content of the instruction which preceded the testing, and will therefore more adequately measure the effectiveness of the instruction." (pp. 15-16)**

In the meantime, a variety of commercially produced criterion-referenced tests have reached the market and are being used throughout the State. Since more than 50 percent of the school districts are now involved in criterion-referenced testing, the use of these mastery tests and the source of testing instruments were surveyed.

Summary of Elementary Practices

The data analyzed would support the conclusion that many practices advocated in the Regents position paper are now more commonly used in New York State than in the period preceding its publication. The

TABLE XI

SOURCES OF MASTERY TESTING OF SELECTED OBJECTIVES

Source	Number and Percent of Districts Using Selected Sources In:			
	New York State		New York City	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Commercial management system	209	56.2	7	46.7
SPPED - CAM Systems	33	8.9	1	6.7
District developed objectives and tests	133	35.8	1	6.7
Building developed objectives and tests	92	24.7	8	53.3
Other sources	97	26.1	8	53.3

reported increase in the use of diagnosis and inservice training is an example of this as is the increase in multimedia materials supplementing more traditional textual materials and workbooks.

In other areas, little change has occurred. This is noted especially in the reported use of various basal reading series. The series most popular in 1969-70 still dominates the field. However, more recent editions of these series tend to increase their emphasis on phonetic decoding and to introduce these elements earlier in their instructional sequences. Thus, no definitive conclusion can be drawn about change or lack thereof in teaching approaches used from the data reported.

Quite clearly, public schools have become more accountable in terms of measuring student reading achievement since 95 percent of all districts reporting make use of achievement tests in addition to the State's Pupil Evaluation Program.

It is also evident that the foundation for elementary reading programs is being laid at an earlier age with 87 percent of the districts reporting readiness programs at the kindergarten level.

Current practices in reading would seem to be a reflection of policies and positions on reading instruction advocated by the State Education Department and the Board of Regents.

Reading in the Secondary School

In addition to policies cited in the position paper for elementary schools, the Regents firmly endorse educational experiences to increase reading and reading-related skills in a variety of secondary level programs. The Regents view the responsibilities of the secondary teacher as reflected in the following statement:

> **"The teaching of reading must not be exclusively confined to any time or place in the school, but must pervade the entire educational program. Although development of reading proficiency for all students requires a well-planned program of systematic instruction in essential skills, reading instruction must not be isolated**

> **from other aspects of the learning and communication processes. In all his educational experiences, the student should gain reading and reading-related skills, and should be motivated to increase his reading capacity by interest in a variety of subjects. The principles of a learner-centered, diagnostic and prescriptive reading program apply throughout all areas of the elementary and secondary curriculums, and every teacher has a responsibility for awareness and application of these principles.**
>
> **"Reading instruction is universally recognized as a major component of the elementary program. However, every secondary teacher also has a responsibility for providing direct instruction in comprehension skills pertinent to his subject area, geared to the ability and achievement levels of the students in his classes. English teachers continue to have a major responsibility for providing direct instruction in a wide range of reading skills to the broad segment of secondary students for whom no special reading programs are offered." (p. 12)**

The survey examined the degree to which practices consistent with this position prevail in the secondary schools of New York State.

Differentiation of Instruction

Since diagnostic-prescriptive teaching of reading requires differentiation of instruction based on individual needs, the survey assessed practices used for this purpose.

Of the three most common accommodations for the differentiation of reading instruction, the most pervasive in the schools statewide was the provision of multilevel materials for the secondary reading program. In all 12 BOCES regions, at least 65 percent of respondents in each region reported such materials were provided. Overall statewide, 80 percent of the school districts surveyed provided differentiated materials on various levels of reading difficulty as a means for improving the reading program. About one-half of the districts reported the use of individualized learning packages. This is also common in New York City where about 18 out of 27 respondents report their use. Because of the structure of the New York City community district, these responses can only be applied to the junior high levels since senior high schools under centralized control were not included in the general distribution of the survey.

The third most common practice at secondary levels was differentiated pacing of instruction. This was reported by 61 percent of all responding districts. In addition, many respondents cited other methods for differentiating instruction. Among these were grouping by needs and/or reading levels, individualized programming in learning centers, team teaching, tutoring and other supplementary instructional services.

Assistance to Teachers

Closely related to practices for differentiation were various forms of assistance to secondary teachers for students reading below grade level. As might be expected, provision of multilevel materials was again prevalent. This was followed closely by direct assistance to teachers in improving student skills within the classroom; assistance of these two types was reported statewide by 67.6 percent and 64.2 percent, respectively.

Forty-two percent of the respondents reported use of study guides for vocabulary improvement and comprehension development. This was most frequent in New York City, the Central area and Lower Hudson BOCES region and least prevalent in the Northeast and Ontario regions where only one-fifth of the districts reported their use.

A total of 29 percent of the districts reported that teachers were provided material rewritten at easy-to-read levels, while 22 percent reported that inservice programs were provided to subject matter teachers on a cyclical basis. Only one region, the Northeast, reported no inservice at the secondary level. On the other hand, in the Central BOCES region, about 46 percent of the districts reported cyclical secondary inservice courses. However, less positively, 68 districts, almost one-tenth of all respondents, report that no help is provided for subject matter teachers in dealing with less able readers.

Of special interest are the arrangements describing supplementary services to students two or more years below their grade level. Here again, it must be noted that some 37 districts statewide provide no formal supplementary assistance to the severely disabled reader at the secondary level. Where help is provided, the most common arrangement for improving reading skills is regularly scheduled small group corrective instruction. Three-fourths of the responding school districts reported such instruction. Other arrangements were reported used in more than one-third of all districts. Among these were reading laboratories at which attendance may have been either mandated or voluntary. About 39 percent of the districts report use of laboratories in which participation is mandatory, while 33 percent permitted attendance on a voluntary basis.

Other instructional settings were reported by 135 respondents, most common were corrective or remedial English classes, teacher aides in classrooms, study skills programs, elective or mandatory developmental reading courses, and tutoring.

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Bureau of Reading Education
Albany, New York 12234

SURVEY OF CURRENT PRACTICES IN READING EDUCATION

1975-76

School District Identification

This form has been designed for completion by the person(s) most familiar with the district's reading education programs and policies. It is important that all questions appropriate to your school district be answered. Directions and guidelines are presented throughout the form.

Please return this form by January 15, 1976 to:

Bureau of Statistical Services
Room 563, Education Building Annex
State Education Department
Albany, New York 12234

Person completing this form:

Name _____

Title _____

Phone Number _____ _____
(Area Code)

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Albany, New York 12234

DEFINITION OF TERMS
SURVEY OF CURRENT PRACTICES IN READING EDUCATION

The Bureau of Reading Education of the State Education Department has found that the terms corrective, developmental and remedial are frequently confused in general usage. These terms were adopted by authorities in the field of reading to avoid the confusion which can result in labeling all types of individual and small group instruction as "remedial reading."

IN COMPLETING THIS SURVEY, USE THE DEFINITIONS BELOW IN INTERPRETING AND ANSWERING QUESTIONS:

Developmental Reading

Classroom instruction for pupils who are reading up to their potential capacity and are progressing in accordance with their ability is classified as developmental. Students who have limited capacity and are reading below grade level may be in developmental programs. Such students are not necessarily corrective or remedial readers.

Corrective Reading

Corrective reading is provided for students reading below potential capacity if they do not show serious symptoms of neurological or emotional disability. If the student has the potential capacity to read at a higher level and is not doing so, he belongs in the corrective reading program and needs assistance. Corrective reading is characterized by small group instruction (5-8 students) under the direction of a special reading teacher.

Remedial Reading

Remedial reading programs are for students with handicapping conditions which cause reading problems. Common causes can be traced to neurological impairment stemming from some type of brain damage, serious emotional disorders with many causative factors involved, and some types of physical disorders. Treatment may be based on a highly intensive specialized diagnosis and prescriptive teaching on a tutorial basis under the guidance of a reading clinician. This term is highly restrictive and applies only to clinical reading programs.

Mention of specific tests, materials, or techniques in this questionnaire in no way reflects intention of the Bureau of Reading Education to recommend their use. They are simply illustrative of those most commonly reported or observed in use in New York State schools.

DIRECTIONS: This questionnaire has been designed to be used in all public school districts in New York State. Some questions apply to specific grade levels. Answer only those items which are appropriate for the grade levels taught in your district. Before answering questions relating to types of reading programs (developmental, corrective, or remedial), please refer to the definitions on the previous page.

For purposes of this survey, your district is defined as using a particular practice at a grade level if it is used in at least one class for that grade level.

General Information

1. At what grade levels are each of the following programs used in your district? (Check all that apply.)

	PreK-K	1-3	4-6	7-9	10-12
a. Developmental reading program	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Corrective reading program	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Remedial reading program	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. For each of the following programs, indicate the number of students and teachers involved. For each type of program, enter the average class size.

	Number of Students	Number of Teachers	Average Class Size
a. Developmental program	☐	☐	☐
b. Corrective program	☐	☐	☐
c. Remedial program	☐	☐	☐

3. a. Are in-service education opportunities available for personnel in the reading program? . . . . . Yes ☐ (1) No ☐ (2)

b. If yes, when are in-service courses scheduled? (Check all that apply.)

1. In sessions prior to school year . . . . . ☐
2. In after-school sessions . ☐
3. In before-school sessions . ☐
4. During released school time . . . . . ☐
5. During summer vacations . . . . ☐
6. During other vacations . . . . ☐
7. On Saturdays . . . . . ☐
8. Other (specify) _____ _____ ☐

c. If in-service courses are available, what personnel have the opportunity to participate? (Check all that apply.)

1. Administrators . . . . . ☐
2. Elementary teachers . . . . ☐
3. Secondary teachers . . . . ☐
4. Paraprofessionals . . . . . ☐
5. Reading specialists . . . . . ☐
6. Special services staff . . . . ☐
7. Other (specify) _____ _____ ☐

Elementary Reading Program

NOTE: QUESTIONS 4 THROUGH 19 SHOULD BE ANSWERED ONLY BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS WHICH INCLUDE ELEMENTARY GRADES. DISTRICTS WITH NO ELEMENTARY GRADES SHOULD PROCEED TO QUESTION 20.

4. At what grade does your formal reading readiness program start? (Check one box only.)

a. Prekindergarten . . . . . ☐ (1)
b. Kindergarten . . . . . ☐ (2)
c. Grade 1 . . . . . ☐ (3)

5. Which of the following materials are used for developing reading readiness at the grade levels indicated? (If a particular material is used at both PreK and K-6, check "BOTH.")

	PreK (1)	K-6 (2)	Both (3)
a. Readiness program accompanying basal reader series . . .	☐	☐	☐
b. Perceptual motor development materials	☐	☐	☐
c. Montessori materials	☐	☐	☐
d. I.T.A. (Initial Teaching Alphabet)	☐	☐	☐
e. Language development kits	☐	☐	☐
f. McGraw-Hill K E L P	☐	☐	☐
g. Teacher-made materials	☐	☐	☐
h. Other (specify) _____	☐	☐	☐

6. Which of the following reading related diagnostic devices are used at the grade levels indicated? (If a particular device is not used, check "NONE.")

	PreK	K	1	2-3	4-6	None
a. Individual I.Q. tests	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Readiness testing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Group reading diagnostic survey	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Individual reading diagnostic tests . .	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Teacher observation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Tests of motor skills	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Vision tests	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Hearing tests	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Language development tests	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j. Other (specify) _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

7. a. With how many students were the following reading related diagnostic devices used during the 1974-75 school year? (Please estimate, if an exact count is not readily available.)

	Number of Students by Grade Level		
	PreK-K	1-3	4-6
1. Individual I.Q. tests			
2. Readiness testing			
3. Reading diagnostic survey			
4. Individual reading diagnostic tests			
5. Observation			
6. Tests of motor skills			
7. Vision tests			
8. Hearing tests			
9. Language development tests			
10. Other (specify) _____			

b. At which grade levels does the district differentiate reading instruction on the basis of diagnostic information determined by such devices? (Check all that apply.)

1. PreK-K ☐
2. 1-3 ☐
3. 4-6 ☐

8. Which of the following practices does the district use for differentiating instruction? (Check all that apply.)

a. Individual programming ☐
b. Grouping by instructional level ☐
c. Grouping by learning rate ☐
d. Other (specify) _____ ☐

9. What approach(es) are used in the teaching of reading in the district? (Check all that apply.)

a. Phonics ☐
b. i/t/a ☐
c. Linguistic ☐
d. Language experience ☐
e. Programmed learning ☐
f. Other (specify) _____ ☐

10. What basal reader(s) are used in the district? (Check all that apply.)

a. Allyn and Bacon, Inc. . . . ☐
b. American Book Company . . . ☐
c. Ginn and Company . . . . . ☐
d. i/t/a . . . . . ☐
e. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston . . . . . ☐
f. Houghton Mifflin Company . . . ☐
g. Lippincott . . . . . ☐
h. Macmillan . . . . . ☐
i. Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc. ☐
j. Scott, Foresman and Company . ☐
k. Other (specify) _____ ☐

11. If basal readers are used, how are they selected? (Check all that apply.)

a. District-wide selection of single basal reader . . . . . ☐
b. District-wide selection of co-basals . . . . . ☐
c. District-wide selection of multi-basals . . . . . ☐
d. School-wide selection of single basal reader . . . . . ☐
e. School-wide selection of co-basals . . . . . ☐
f. School-wide selection of multi-basals . . . . . ☐
g. Grade-wide selection of single basal reader . . . . . ☐
h. Grade-wide selection of co-basals . . . . . ☐
i. Grade-wide selection of multi-basals . . . . . ☐
j. Individual teacher selection of single basal reader . . . . . ☐
k. Individual teacher selection of co-basals . . . . . ☐
l. Individual teacher selection of multi-basals . . . . . ☐
m. Other (specify) _____ ☐

12. Which of the following supplementary materials are used in the reading program? (Check all that apply.)

a. Supplementary texts (in addition to basal reader) . . . . . ☐
b. Supplementary activity workbooks and/or sheets . . . . . ☐
c. Film strips . . . . . ☐
d. Tapes . . . . . ☐
e. Laboratory kits . . . . . ☐
f. Tachistoscopic devices . . . . . ☐
g. Reading pacers . . . . . ☐
h. Game techniques . . . . . ☐
i. Muscular coordination devices . . . . . ☐
j. Programs designed to improve visual perception . . . . . ☐
k. Other (specify) _____ ☐

13. Which of the following services are incorporated with the reading program? (Check all that apply.)

a. Psychological services . . . ☐
b. Social services . . . . . ☐
c. Guidance services . . . . . ☐
d. Physical education . . . . . ☐
e. Paraprofessional services . . ☐
f. Speech services . . . . . ☐
g. Other (specify) _____ ☐

14. To whom does the superintendent or supervising (district) principal delegate primary responsibility for administration and supervision of the reading program? (Check one item only.)

a. Deputy, Associate, or Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education, Curriculum or Instruction . . . . . ☐ (01)
b. Director or Coordinator of Early Childhood Education . . . . . ☐ (02)
c. Director or Coordinator of Elementary Education, Curriculum or Instruction . . . . . ☐ (03)
d. Principal . . . . . ☐ (04)
e. Assistant Principal . . . . . ☐ (05)
f. Prekindergarten, Kindergarten, Early Childhood Education, or Common Branch (1-6) Supervisor . . . . . ☐ (06)
g. Reading Director, Coordinator, or Supervisor . . . . . ☐ (07)
h. Reading Department Head or Chairman . . . . . ☐ (08)
i. English or Language Arts Department Head or Chairman . . . . . ☐ (09)
j. Reading Consultant or Specialist . . . . . ☐ (10)
k. Other (specify) _____ ☐ (11)

15. Which of the following instruments are used to evaluate the reading program? (Check all that apply.)

a. Mastery testing of selected objectives . . . . . ☐
b. Achievement tests . . . . . ☐
c. Reading survey tests . . . . ☐
d. Basal reader end of level tests . . . . . ☐
e. Other (specify) _____ ☐

16. If you use mastery testing of selected objectives in evaluation of the reading program, what is its source? (Check all that apply.)

a. Commerical management systems . . . . . ☐
b. SPPED-CAM Systems . . . . . ☐
c. District developed objectives and tests . . . . . ☐
d. Building developed objectives and tests . . . . . ☐
e. Other (specify) _____ ☐

17. Which standardized reading achievement test(s) are administered in the district? (Check all that apply.)

a. Metropolitan Achievement Tests . . . . . ☐
b. Stanford Achievement Tests . ☐
c. Iowa Tests of Basic Skills . ☐
d. California Achievement Tests . ☐
e. SRA Achievement Series . . . . ☐
f. Other (specify) _____ ☐

18. Indicate the number of students to whom each of the following reading survey test(s) were administered during the 1974-75 school year. (Estimate if an exact count is not available. If a certain test was not administered, enter "zero" in the appropriate box.)

a. Gates Reading Survey Test . . . . . ☐
b. Developmental Reading Tests . . . . . ☐
c. Durrell-Sullivan Reading Capacity and Achievement Test . . . . . ☐
d. Gates Primary Reading Tests . . . . . ☐
e. Gates Advanced Primary Reading Tests . . . . . ☐
f. Gates Basic Reading Tests - Elementary . . . . . ☐
g. Gates MacGinitie Reading Test . . . . . ☐
h. Other (specify) _____ ☐

19. What information is submitted to the junior high school(s) from the elementary school reading program? (Check all that apply.)

a. Highest levels of materials in reading completed by each student . . . . ☐
b. Individual reading test scores . . . . . ☐
c. Group reading test scores for the student . . . . . ☐
d. Checklist of skills mastered by the student . . . . . ☐
e. Other (specify) _____ ☐

Secondary Reading Program

NOTE: QUESTIONS 20 THROUGH 24 SHOULD BE ANSWERED ONLY BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS WHICH HAVE SECONDARY GRADES (7-12).

20. What information from the elementary school is used to determine pupil placement in the secondary school reading program (see question 19)? (Check all that apply.)

a. Highest levels of materials in reading completed by each student . . . . ☐
b. Individual reading test scores . . . . . ☐
c. Group reading test scores for the student . . . . . ☐
d. Checklist of skills mastered by the student . . . . . ☐
e. Other (specify) _____ ☐

21. Which of the following practices does the district use for differentiating instruction? (Check all that apply.)

a. Individualized learning packages . . . . . ☐

b. Instruction in multi-level materials . . . . . ☐

c. Differentiated pacing . . . . . ☐

d. Other (specify) _____ ☐

22. What assistance is given to subject matter teachers to help students reading below grade level? (Check all that apply.)

a. Assistance in improving reading skills within the classroom setting . . . ☐

b. Provision of study guides for vocabulary improvement and comprehension development . . . . . ☐

c. Rewritten materials in content areas at easy-to-read levels . . . . . ☐

d. Cycled in-service courses in reading . . . . . ☐

e. Multi-level supplementary materials . . . . . ☐

f. Other (specify) _____ ☐

g. No special assistance is given . . . . . ☐

23. Which of the following arrangements are made for improving reading skills of secondary school students reading two or more years below grade placement? (Check all that apply.)

a. Mandatory lab instruction . . . . . ☐

b. Voluntary lab instruction . . . . . ☐

c. Small group corrective sessions, scheduled regularly . . . . . ☐

d. Individual corrective sessions, scheduled regularly . . . . . ☐

e. Other (specify) _____ ☐

f. No supplementary assistance in improving reading skills is given . . . . ☐

24. a. Which of the following standardized reading achievement test(s) are administered in your district in the secondary school program? (Check all that apply.)

1. California Reading . . . . . ☐
2. Cooperative English Tests Reading Comprehension . . . . . ☐
3. Davis Reading . . . . . ☐
4. Iowa Silent Reading . . . . . ☐
5. Nelson-Denny Reading . . . . . ☐
6. SRA Reading Record . . . . . ☐
7. Other (specify) _____ ☐
8. No standardized reading achievement test is administered . . . . . ☐

b. If such tests are used, check below the grades at which they are administered during each semester.

	First Semester (September - January)	Second Semester (February - June)
1. Seventh Grade	☐	☐
2. Eighth Grade	☐	☐
3. Ninth Grade	☐	☐
4. Tenth Grade	☐	☐
5. Eleventh Grade	☐	☐
6. Twelfth Grade	☐	☐
7. Ungraded Secondary (Handicapped)	☐	☐

c. If such tests are administered, what use is made of the results? (Check all that apply.)

1. Criteria for grouping students . . . . . ☐
2. Criteria for differentiating instruction . . . . . ☐
3. Criteria for selection and use of materials . . . . . ☐
4. Criteria for selection of students for special programs . . . . . ☐
5. Criteria for placement of students in selected curriculum strands . . ☐
6. Factor in counseling students . . . . . ☐
7. Placed in individual student files . . . . . ☐
8. Other (specify) _____ ☐

IN-DEPTH SURVEY OF CURRENT PRACTICES IN READING EDUCATION 1975-76

Table Summaries of School District Forms By BOCES Regions, New York City, and Total State

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Information Center on Education
June 1976

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Corresponding Questionnaire Number
1A	Availability of Developmental Reading Programs by Grade Level	1a
1B	Availability of Corrective Reading Programs by Grade Level	1b
1C	Availability of Remedial Reading Programs by Grade Level	1c
2	Number of Students and Teachers and Median Class Size by Type of Reading Program	2
3A	Inservice Education for Reading Programs	3a, 3b
3B	Participants in Inservice Education for Reading Programs	3c
4	Initiation of Formal Reading Readiness Programs	4
5A	Use of Reading Readiness Materials in Pre-kindergarten[a/]	5
5B	Use of Reading Readiness Materials in Grades K-6[a/]	5
5C	Use of Reading Readiness Materials in Grades PreK-6	5
6A	Use of Individual I.Q. Tests as Reading Related Diagnostic Devices in Elementary Programs	6a
6B	Use of Readiness Tests as Reading Related Diagnostic Devices in Elementary Programs	6b
6C	Use of Group Reading Diagnostic Surveys as Reading Related Diagnostic Devices in Elementary Programs	6c
6D	Use of Individual Reading Diagnostic Tests as Reading Related Diagnostic Devices in Elementary Programs	6d
6E	Use of Teacher Observation as a Reading Related Diagnostic Device in Elementary Programs	6e
6F	Use of Tests of Motor Skills as Reading Related Diagnostic Devices in Elementary Programs	6f
6G	Use of Vision Tests as Reading Related Diagnostic Devices in Elementary Programs	6g

Table		Corresponding Questionnaire Number
6H	Use of Hearing Tests as Reading Related Diagnostic Devices in Elementary Programs	6h
6I	Use of Language Development Tests as Reading Related Diagnostic Devices in Elementary Programs	6i
6J	Use of "Other" Reading Related Diagnostic Devices in Elementary Programs	6j
7	Use of Information From Reading Related Diagnostic Devices in Elementary Programs	7
8	Practices for Differentiating Reading Instruction in Elementary Programs	8
9	Approaches for Teaching Reading in Elementary Programs	9
10	Basal Readers Used in Elementary Programs	10
11	Methods of Selection of Basal Readers for Elementary Programs	11
12	Use of Supplementary Materials in Elementary Programs	12
13	Auxiliary Services for Elementary Reading Programs	13
14	Responsibility for Administration and Supervision of the Elementary Reading Program	14
15	Instruments Used to Evaluate the Elementary Reading Program	15
16	Sources of Mastery Testing of Selected Objectives	16
17	Utilization of Standardized Reading Achievement Tests in Elementary Programs	17
18	Utilization of Reading Survey Tests in Elementary Programs	18
19	Information Submitted to the Junior High School From Elementary School Reading Programs	19
20	Utilization of Information From Elementary School to Determine Pupil Placement in Secondary School Reading Programs	20
21	Practices for Differentiating Reading Instruction in Secondary Programs	21

Total		Corresponding Questionnaire Number
22	Assistance for Subject Matter Teachers to Help Students Reading Below Grade Level in Secondary Programs	22
23	Arrangements for Improving Reading Skills of Secondary School Students Reading Two or More Years Below Grade Placement	23
24	Use of Standardized Reading Tests for Secondary Reading Programs	24a
25A	Administration of Standardized Reading Achievement Tests During the First Semester (September - January) of the School Year, by Grade Level, Secondary Programs	24b
25B	Administration of Standardized Reading Achievement Tests During the Second Semester (February - June) of the School Year, by Grade Level, Secondary Programs	24b
26	Use of Results of Standardized Reading Achievement Tests in Secondary Programs	24c

a/Materials are used in pre-kindergarten, but not in grades K-6.

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF DISTRICTS RESPONDING TO THE
SURVEY OF CURRENT PRACTICES IN READING EDUCATION

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number of Respondents	Percent of Population in Region
Capital District	95	93.1%
Central	48	94.1
Central Western	68	90.7
Lower Hudson	57	86.4
Mid-Hudson	44	84.6
Mohawk	40	97.6
Nassau	55	96.5
Northeast	29	100.0
Ontario	34	94.4
Southern Tier	75	93.8
Suffolk	64	86.5
Western	90	98.9
New York City	27	84.4
Total State	726	94.5%

TABLE 1A

AVAILABILITY OF DEVELOPMENTAL READING PROGRAMS
BY GRADE LEVEL

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Offering Developmental Reading at Indicated Grade Levels									
	Pre-K - K		1 - 3		4 - 6		7 - 9		10 - 12	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	72	75.8%	90	94.7%	90	94.7%	43	45.3%	19	20.0%
Central	36	75.0	47	97.9	47	97.9	24	50.0	11	22.9
Central Western	51	75.0	67	98.5	66	97.1	35	51.5	9	13.2
Lower Hudson	42	73.7	56	98.2	56	98.2	39	68.4	19	33.3
Mid-Hudson	29	65.9	42	95.5	42	95.5	22	50.0	8	18.2
Mohawk	30	75.0	37	92.5	37	92.5	14	35.0	5	12.5
Nassau	39	70.9	50	90.9	50	90.9	25	45.5	18	32.7
Northeast	22	75.9	27	93.1	28	96.6	8	27.6	2	6.9
Ontario	27	79.4	34	100.0	34	100.0	17	50.0	4	11.8
Southern Tier	51	68.0	69	92.0	67	89.3	35	46.7	21	28.0
Suffolk	43	67.2	62	96.9	63	98.4	35	54.7	20	31.3
Western	60	66.7	87	96.7	87	96.7	38	42.2	13	14.4
New York City	14	51.9	26	96.3	26	96.3	22	81.5	6	22.2
Total State	516	71.1%	694	95.6%	693	95.5%	357	49.2%	155	21.3%

NOTE: Percents are based on the number of respondents in each row. The same procedure is followed in all subsequent tables, unless otherwise specified.

TABLE 1B

AVAILABILITY OF CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAMS
BY GRADE LEVEL

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Offering Corrective Reading at Indicated Grade Levels									
	Pre-K - K		1 - 3		4 - 6		7 - 9		10 - 12	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	20	21.1%	87	91.6%	86	90.5%	67	70.5%	31	32.6%
Central	11	22.9	45	93.8	45	93.8	39	81.3	25	52.1
Central Western	13	19.1	62	91.2	60	88.2	49	72.1	23	33.8
Lower Hudson	13	22.8	48	84.2	52	91.2	45	78.9	31	54.4
Mid-Hudson	15	34.1	40	90.9	40	90.9	36	81.8	19	43.2
Mohawk	7	17.5	38	95.0	38	95.0	28	70.0	9	22.5
Nassau	12	21.8	50	90.9	50	90.9	41	74.5	32	58.2
Northeast	7	24.1	27	93.1	27	93.1	14	48.3	4	13.8
Ontario	9	26.5	32	94.1	32	94.1	24	70.6	12	35.3
Southern Tier	15	20.0	69	92.0	68	90.7	58	77.3	29	38.7
Suffolk	11	17.2	63	98.4	62	96.9	47	73.4	26	40.6
Western	22	24.4	83	92.2	83	92.2	67	74.4	35	38.9
New York City	4	14.8	24	88.9	26	96.3	26	96.3	7	25.9
Total State	159	21.9%	668	92.0%	669	92.1%	541	74.5%	283	39.0%

TABLE 1C

AVAILABILITY OF REMEDIAL READING PROGRAMS
BY GRADE LEVEL

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Offering Remedial Reading at Indicated Grade Levels									
	Pre-K - K		1 - 3		4 - 6		7 - 9		10 - 12	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	10	10.5%	42	44.2%	42	44.2%	30	31.6%	18	18.9%
Central	3	6.3	22	45.8	23	47.9	19	39.6	14	29.2
Central Western	3	4.4	34	50.0	35	51.5	26	38.2	16	23.5
Lower Hudson	11	19.3	42	73.7	43	75.4	36	63.2	19	33.3
Mid-Hudson	8	18.2	25	56.8	24	54.5	17	38.6	8	18.2
Mohawk	3	7.5	15	37.5	15	37.5	8	20.0	5	12.5
Nassau	8	14.5	40	72.7	38	69.1	31	56.4	23	41.8
Northeast	3	10.3	8	27.6	10	34.5	6	20.7	2	6.9
Ontario	4	11.8	13	38.2	13	38.2	6	17.6	1	2.9
Southern Tier	4	5.3	28	37.3	29	38.7	15	20.0	6	8.0
Suffolk	5	7.8	44	68.8	48	75.0	31	48.4	19	29.7
Western	6	6.7	37	41.1	37	41.1	23	25.6	16	17.8
New York City	0	0.0	14	51.9	13	48.1	12	44.4	6	22.2
Total State	68	9.4%	364	50.1%	370	51.0%	260	35.8%	153	21.1%

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF STUDENTS AND TEACHERS AND MEDIAN CLASS SIZE
BY TYPE OF READING PROGRAM

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Developmental Program			Corrective Program			Remedial Program		
	Number of Students	Number of Teachers	Median Class Size	Number of Students	Number of Teachers	Median Class Size	Number of Students	Number of Teachers	Median Class Size
Capital District	115,418	4,329	25.8	18,820	684	7.2	3,117	191	3.7
Central	99,651	3,640	25.1	17,831	778	7.8	1,343	123	3.9
Central Western	127,971	4,901	26.1	14,387	507	7.1	2,762	185	3.8
Lower Hudson	116,616	4,597	24.5	24,773	940	8.2	11,520	511	3.9
Mid-Hudson	81,872	3,220	24.9	10,244	227	7.9	1,795	103	3.7
Mohawk	39,766	1,609	26.2	6,056	155	6.1	805	37	3.4
Nassau	145,072	6,256	24.7	21,569	607	7.7	6,003	324	4.1
Northeast	14,272	652	21.4	4,666	144	7.4	610	47	5.6
Ontario	26,652	1,044	25.8	4,590	149	5.6	569	37	3.6
Southern Tier	78,124	2,680	23.9	13,669	353	7.4	1,186	70	3.4
Suffolk	161,129	5,827	24.5	32,532	1,553	7.1	5,850	316	3.6
Western	156,124	5,862	25.2	27,765	1,088	7.8	3,323	158	4.9
New York City	337,129	11,122	31.9	73,515	1,321	13.1	29,653	2,024	11.8
Total State	1,499,796	55,739	25.2	270,417	8,506	7.5	68,536	4,126	3.9

TABLE 3A

INSERVICE EDUCATION FOR READING PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Offering Inservice Education		Number and Percent of Districts Using Indicated Scheduling Arrangements For Inservice Education					
			Sessions Prior to School Year		After-school Sessions		Before-school Sessions	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	71	74.7%	12	12.6%	50	52.6%	9	9.5%
Central	44	91.7	11	22.9	40	83.3	12	25.0
Central Western	60	88.2	6	8.8	52	76.5	10	14.7
Lower Hudson	48	84.2	7	12.3	44	77.2	4	7.0
Mid-Hudson	38	86.4	2	4.5	34	77.3	2	4.5
Mohawk	34	85.0	3	7.5	25	62.5	4	10.0
Nassau	53	96.4	5	9.1	51	92.7	9	16.4
Northeast	18	62.1	2	6.9	10	34.5	0	0.0
Ontario	26	76.5	5	14.7	21	61.8	1	2.9
Southern Tier	57	76.0	6	8.0	46	61.3	3	4.0
Suffolk	49	76.6	8	12.5	47	73.4	8	12.5
Western	77	85.6	15	16.7	60	66.7	17	18.9
New York City	26	96.3	8	29.6	20	74.1	0	0.0
Total State	601	82.8%	90	12.4%	500	68.9%	79	10.9%

(Concluded)

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using Indicated Scheduling Arrangements For Inservice Education									
	During Released School Time		During Summer Vacations		During Other Vacations		On Saturdays		Other Arrangements	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	54	56.8%	11	11.6%	1	1.1%	8	8.4%	10	10.5%
Central	33	68.8	19	39.6	2	4.2	12	25.0	6	12.5
Central Western	29	42.6	18	26.5	1	1.5	8	11.8	13	19.1
Lower Hudson	18	31.6	20	35.1	1	1.8	5	8.8	11	19.3
Mid-Hudson	18	40.9	4	9.1	1	2.3	3	6.8	6	13.6
Mohawk	25	62.5	6	15.0	0	0.0	5	12.5	6	15.0
Nassau	15	27.3	14	25.5	1	1.8	7	12.7	7	12.7
Northeast	11	37.9	3	10.3	0	0.0	2	6.9	2	6.9
Ontario	11	32.4	9	26.5	0	0.0	6	17.6	6	17.6
Southern Tier	38	50.7	9	12.0	0	0.0	7	9.3	6	8.0
Suffolk	14	21.9	12	18.8	0	0.0	6	9.4	7	10.9
Western	43	47.8	25	27.8	0	0.0	12	13.3	12	13.3
New York City	17	63.0	1	3.7	1	3.7	0	0.0	5	18.5
Total State	326	44.9%	151	20.8%	8	1.1%	81	11.2%	97	13.4%

TABLE 3B

PARTICIPANTS IN INSERVICE EDUCATION FOR READING PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Offering Programs for:													
	Administrators		Elementary Teachers		Secondary Teachers		Para-Professionals		Reading Specialists		Special Services Staff		Other Staff	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	62	65.3%	65	68.4%	56	58.9%	32	33.7%	65	68.4%	41	43.2%	8	8.4%
Central	42	87.5	42	87.5	42	87.5	32	66.7	42	87.5	28	58.3	7	14.6
Central Western	56	82.4	59	86.8	52	76.5	39	57.4	54	79.4	38	55.9	8	11.8
Lower Hudson	42	73.7	47	82.5	43	75.4	27	47.4	43	75.4	30	52.6	9	15.8
Mid-Hudson	30	68.2	35	79.5	27	61.4	24	54.5	36	81.8	21	47.7	4	9.1
Mohawk	31	77.5	29	72.5	24	60.0	18	45.0	32	80.0	10	25.0	4	10.0
Nassau	51	92.7	52	94.5	39	70.9	20	36.4	53	96.4	42	76.4	4	7.3
Northeast	14	48.3	17	58.6	8	27.6	6	20.7	15	51.7	8	27.6	3	10.3
Ontario	21	61.8	25	73.5	17	50.0	17	50.0	24	70.6	10	29.4	1	2.9
Southern Tier	48	64.0	53	70.7	45	60.0	39	52.0	48	64.0	30	40.0	9	12.0
Suffolk	44	68.8	49	76.6	41	64.1	32	50.0	45	70.3	29	45.3	3	4.7
Western	68	75.6	69	76.7	54	60.0	48	53.3	69	76.7	33	36.7	9	10.0
New York City	21	77.8	25	92.6	22	81.5	24	88.9	21	77.8	10	37.0	3	11.1
Total State	530	73.0%	567	78.1%	470	64.7%	358	49.3%	547	75.3%	330	45.5%	72	9.9%

TABLE 4

INITIATION OF FORMAL READING READINESS PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Beginning Reading Readiness Program in:					
	Prekindergarten		Kindergarten		Grade One	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Captial District	1	1.1%	90	94.7%	4	4.2%
Central	1	2.1	42	87.5	4	8.3
Central Western	0	0.0	63	92.6	5	7.4
Lower Hudson	2	3.5	46	80.7	9	15.8
Mid-Hudson	2	4.5	36	81.8	4	9.1
Mohawk	1	2.5	37	92.5	2	5.0
Nassau	5	9.1	38	69.1	8	14.5
Northeast	1	3.4	25	86.2	3	10.3
Ontario	2	5.9	31	91.2	1	2.9
Southern Tier	1	1.3	74	98.7	0	0.0
Suffolk	1	1.6	55	85.9	8	12.5
Western	3	3.3	77	85.6	9	10.0
New York City	1	3.7	23	85.2	2	7.4
Total State	21	2.9%	637	87.7%	59	8.1%

TABLE 5A

USE OF READING READINESS MATERIALS IN PRE-KINDERGARTEN[a]/

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using:							
	Readiness Program Accompanying Basal Reader Series		Perceptual Motor Development Materials		Montessori Materials		Initial Teaching Alphabet, i/t/a	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	0	0.0%	1	1.1%	2	2.1%	0	0.0%
Central	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Central Western	1	1.5	1	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
Lower Hudson	0	0.0	1	1.8	1	1.8	0	0.0
Mid-Hudson	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Mohawk	1	2.5	2	5.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Nassau	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.6	0	0.0
Northeast	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Ontario	1	2.9	0	0.0	1	2.9	0	0.0
Southern Tier	1	1.3	2	2.7	1	1.3	0	0.0
Suffolk	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Western	0	0.0	2	2.2	2	2.2	0	0.0
New York City	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total State	4	0.6%	9	1.2%	9	1.2%	0	0.0%

(Concluded)

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using:							
	Language Development Kits		McGraw-Hill KELP		Teacher-made Materials		Other Materials	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.1%	1	1.1%
Central	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0
Central Western	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.9	1	1.5
Lower Hudson	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Mid-Hudson	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Mohawk	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Nassau	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Northeast	1	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Ontario	3	4.0	1	1.3	3	4.0	1	1.3
Southern Tier	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Suffolk	0	0.0	1	1.1	0	0.0	2	2.2
Western	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
New York City	5	0.7%	2	0.3%	7	1.0%	5	0.7%
Total State								

[a]/Materials are used in pre-kindergarten, but not in grades K-6.

TABLE 5B

USE OF READINC READINESS MATERIALS IN GRADES K-6[a/]

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using:							
	Readiness Program Accompanying Basal Reader Series		Perceptual Motor Development Materials		Montessori Materials		Initial Teaching Alphabet, i/t/a	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	84	88.4%	71	74.7%	11	11.6%	5	5.3%
Central	44	91.7	43	89.6	6	12.5	2	4.2
Central Western	62	91.2	60	88.2	2	2.9	3	4.4
Lower Hudson	46	80.7	40	70.2	12	21.1	1	1.8
Mid-Hudson	39	88.6	35	79.5	2	4.5	5	11.4
Mohawk	38	95.0	25	62.5	3	7.5	3	7.5
Nassau	43	78.2	32	58.2	8	14.5	4	7.3
Northeast	25	86.2	20	69.0	2	6.9	1	3.4
Ontario	28	82.4	24	70.6	3	8.8	0	0.0
Southern Tier	70	93.3	58	77.3	3	4.0	5	6.7
Suffolk	60	93.8	56	87.5	19	29.7	10	15.6
Western	84	93.3	67	74.4	3	3.3	8	8.9
New York City	24	88.9	15	55.6	2	7.4	1	3.7
Total State	647	89.1%	546	75.2%	76	10.5%	48	6.6%

(Concluded)

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using:							
	Language Development Kits		McGraw-Hill KELP		Teacher-made Materials		Other Materials	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	68	71.6%	3	3.2%	76	80.0%	44	46.3%
Central	40	83.3	1	2.1	40	83.3	18	37.5
Central Western	52	76.5	2	2.9	61	89.7	26	38.2
Lower Hudson	38	66.7	7	12.3	42	73.7	20	35.1
Mid-Hudson	34	77.3	5	11.4	34	77.3	13	29.5
Mohawk	27	67.5	3	7.5	31	77.5	10	25.0
Nassau	32	58.2	8	14.5	32	58.2	15	27.3
Northeast	18	62.1	0	0.0	20	69.0	10	34.5
Ontario	25	73.5	1	2.9	24	70.6	11	32.4
Southern Tier	46	61.3	2	2.7	59	78.7	22	29.3
Suffolk	47	73.4	5	7.8	55	85.9	23	35.9
Western	56	62.2	6	6.7	74	82.2	25	27.8
New York City	19	70.4	1	3.7	17	63.0	5	18.5
Total State	502	69.1%	44	6.1%	565	77.8%	242	33.3%

[a/]Materials are used in grades K-6, but not in pre-kindergarten.

TABLE 5C

USE OF READING READINESS MATERIALS IN GRADES PRE-K - 6

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using:							
	Readiness Program Accompanying Basal Reader Series		Perceptual Motor Development Materials		Montessori Materials		Initial Teaching Alphabet, i/t/a	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	5	5.3%	12	12.6%	0	0.0%	1	1.1%
Central	2	4.2	4	8.3	1	2.1	0	0.0
Central Western	3	4.4	6	8.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
Lower Hudson	4	7.0	10	17.5	3	5.3	0	0.0
Mid-Hudson	1	2.3	4	9.1	1	2.3	1	2.3
Mohawk	1	2.5	3	7.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
Nassau	4	7.3	17	30.9	7	12.7	2	3.6
Northeast	0	0.0	3	10.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Ontario	3	8.8	4	11.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
Southern Tier	0	0.0	5	6.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Suffolk	3	4.7	5	7.8	0	0.0	1	1.6
Western	1	1.1	7	7.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
New York City	1	3.7	7	25.9	1	3.7	0	0.0
Total State	28	3.9%	87	12.0%	13	1.8%	5	0.7%

(Concluded)

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using:							
	Language Development Kits		McGraw-Hill KELP		Teacher-made Materials		Other Materials	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	10	10.5%	0	0.0%	12	12.6%	3	3.2%
Central	3	6.3	0	0.0	5	10.4	0	0.0
Central Western	5	7.4	0	0.0	5	7.4	1	1.5
Lower Hudson	9	15.8	1	1.8	11	19.3	3	5.3
Mid-Hudson	3	6.8	0	0.0	4	9.1	1	2.3
Mohawk	1	2.5	1	2.5	5	12.5	1	2.5
Nassau	16	29.1	1	1.8	17	30.9	2	3.6
Northeast	4	13.8	0	0.0	7	24.1	2	6.9
Ontario	1	2.9	0	0.0	5	14.7	1	2.9
Southern Tier	6	8.0	0	0.0	6	8.0	1	1.3
Suffolk	3	4.7	0	0.0	6	9.4	2	3.1
Western	7	7.8	0	0.0	9	10.0	1	1.1
New York City	5	18.5	0	0.0	8	29.6	0	0.0
Total State	73	10.1%	3	0.4%	100	13.8%	18	2.5%

TABLE 6A

USE OF INDIVIDUAL IQ TESTS AS READING RELATED DIAGNOSTIC DEVICES IN ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using Device at Grade Levels Indicated												Number of Students With Whom Device Was Used During 1974-75 at Grade Levels Indicated		
	Pre-K		K		1		2 - 3		4 - 6		Not Used				
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Pre-K - K	1 - 3	4 - 6
Capital District	8	8.4%	42	44.2%	57	60.0%	69	72.6%	69	72.6%	16	16.8%	1,460	5,146	4,784
Central	4	8.3	30	62.5	32	66.7	39	81.3	36	75.0	7	14.6	1,742	2,743	1,808
Central Western	7	10.3	39	57.4	49	72.1	58	85.3	62	91.2	5	7.4	2,193	5,989	7,196
Lower Hudson	7	12.3	31	54.4	36	63.2	46	80.7	44	77.2	10	17.5	1,237	3,746	3,231
Mid-Hudson	3	6.8	19	43.2	29	65.9	33	75.0	33	75.0	7	15.9	969	4,015	3,464
Mohawk	2	5.0	21	52.5	22	55.0	31	77.5	34	85.0	5	12.5	298	1,482	1,762
Nassau	10	18.2	38	69.1	41	74.5	46	83.6	47	85.5	6	10.9	2,553	7,041	8,554
Northeast	1	3.4	18	62.1	20	69.0	24	82.8	27	93.1	2	6.9	478	1,361	914
Ontario	4	11.8	13	38.2	15	44.1	25	73.5	22	64.7	6	17.6	467	1,427	1,562
Southern Tier	7	9.3	33	44.0	44	58.7	51	68.0	57	76.0	11	14.7	2,040	3,244	3,145
Suffolk	0	0.0	29	45.3	35	54.7	55	85.9	54	84.4	7	10.9	1,292	7,927	6,249
Western	6	6.7	46	51.1	55	61.1	72	80.0	75	83.3	9	10.0	2,028	9,171	11,217
New York City	0	0.0	5	18.5	5	18.5	5	18.5	5	18.5	22	81.5	58	248	655
Total State	59	8.1%	364	50.1%	440	60.6%	554	76.3%	565	77.8%	113	15.6%	16,815	53,540	54,541

TABLE 6B

USE OF READINESS TESTS AS READING RELATED DIAGNOSTIC DEVICES
IN ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using Device at Grade Levels Indicated												Number of Students With Whom Device Was Used During 1974-75 at Grade Levels Indicated		
	Pre-K		K		1		2 - 3		4 - 6		Not Used				
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Pre-K - K	1 - 3	4 - 6
Capital District	12	12.6%	86	90.5%	55	57.9%	15	15.8%	13	13.7%	4	4.2%	12,236	5,984	178
Central	6	12.5	44	91.7	37	77.1	8	16.7	5	10.4	2	4.2	8,652	9,063	336
Central Western	12	17.6	60	88.2	53	77.9	11	16.2	7	10.3	1	1.5	13,194	12,228	2,104
Lower Hudson	12	21.1	47	82.5	41	71.9	15	26.3	12	21.1	3	5.3	9,038	10,261	3,031
Mid-Hudson	7	15.9	38	86.4	21	47.7	6	13.6	3	6.8	4	9.1	9,239	7,908	3,507
Mohawk	4	10.0	35	87.5	26	65.0	5	12.5	5	12.5	1	2.5	4,925	2,262	331
Nassau	12	21.8	47	85.5	35	63.6	10	18.2	4	7.3	4	7.3	14,226	9,998	3,528
Northeast	4	13.8	29	100.0	16	55.2	7	24.1	6	20.7	0	0.0	1,923	1,313	62
Ontario	5	14.7	30	88.2	24	70.6	7	20.6	4	11.8	1	2.9	2,856	2,827	1,160
Southern Tier	12	16.0	67	89.3	40	53.3	8	10.7	6	8.0	4	5.3	8,835	4,959	889
Suffolk	4	6.3	57	89.1	52	81.3	14	21.9	7	10.9	0	0.0	19,911	11,670	3,061
Western	19	21.1	78	86.7	65	72.2	15	16.7	9	10.0	2	2.2	15,289	16,441	1,781
New York City	3	11.1	19	70.4	20	74.1	6	22.2	0	0.0	3	11.1	16,475	16,380	0
Total State	112	15.4%	637	87.7%	485	66.8%	127	17.5%	81	11.2%	29	4.0%	136,799	111,294	19,968

TABLE 6C

USE OF GROUP READING DIAGNOSTIC SURVEYS
AS READING RELATED DIAGNOSTIC DEVICES
IN ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using Device at Grade Levels Indicated												Number of Students With Whom Device Was Used During 1974-75 at Grade Levels Indicated		
	Pre-K		K		1		2 - 3		4 - 6		Not Used				
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Pre-K - K	1 - 3	4 - 6
Capital District	0	0.0%	18	18.9%	57	60.0%	67	70.5%	67	70.5%	20	21.1%	1,619	16,033	16,006
Central	1	2.1	11	22.9	35	72.9	37	77.1	37	77.1	8	16.7	876	15,965	17,921
Central Western	1	1.5	18	26.5	39	57.4	47	69.1	49	72.1	15	22.1	1,506	12,223	13,289
Lower Hudson	1	1.8	8	14.0	27	47.4	37	64.9	37	64.9	16	28.1	746	19,240	21,738
Mid-Hudson	0	0.0	7	15.9	25	56.8	35	79.5	37	84.1	5	11.4	396	11,065	16,161
Mohawk	1	2.5	11	27.5	25	62.5	30	75.0	27	67.5	8	20.0	220	3,125	4,959
Nassau	2	3.6	11	20.0	35	63.6	42	76.4	42	76.4	11	20.0	1,005	20,959	22,914
Northeast	0	0.0	5	17.2	21	72.4	24	82.8	23	79.3	4	13.8	230	2,070	2,516
Ontario	0	0.0	10	29.4	22	64.7	28	82.4	27	79.4	6	17.6	478	4,023	4,736
Southern Tier	0	0.0	15	20.0	42	56.0	60	80.0	63	84.0	8	10.7	156	8,385	11,450
Suffolk	0	0.0	15	23.4	41	64.1	56	87.5	56	87.5	6	9.4	1,933	32,004	33,129
Western	0	0.0	16	17.8	53	58.9	63	70.0	63	70.0	20	22.2	472	34,781	37,428
New York City	0	0.0	2	7.4	6	22.2	22	81.5	22	81.5	4	14.8	3,123	61,603	84,673
Total State	6	0.8%	147	20.2%	428	59.0%	548	75.5%	550	75.8%	131	18.0%	13,260	241,476	286,920

TABLE 6D

USE OF INDIVIDUAL READING DIAGNOSTIC TESTS
AS READING RELATED DIAGNOSTIC DEVICES
IN ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using Device at Grade Levels Indicated												Number of Students With Whom Device Was Used During 1974-75 at Grade Levels Indicated		
	Pre-K		K		1		2 - 3		4 - 6		Not Used				
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Pre-K - K	1 - 3	4 - 6
Capital District	1	1.1%	31	32.6%	75	78.9%	86	90.5%	84	88.4%	7	7.4%	892	8,653	9,910
Central	2	4.2	22	45.8	40	83.3	44	91.7	42	87.5	4	8.3	1,380	6,479	5,884
Central Western	0	0.0	22	32.4	49	72.1	60	88.2	62	91.2	5	7.4	1,450	8,723	8,303
Lower Hudson	1	1.8	24	42.1	46	80.7	55	96.5	53	93.0	2	3.5	465	15,807	15,730
Mid-Hudson	0	0.0	11	25.0	33	75.0	38	86.4	37	84.1	3	6.8	677	7,116	6,553
Mohawk	1	2.5	14	35.0	35	87.5	36	90.0	36	90.0	3	7.5	664	4,364	3,958
Nassau	2	3.6	24	43.6	46	83.6	51	92.7	50	90.9	3	5.5	34,301	11,643	13,764
Northeast	1	3.4	9	31.0	23	79.3	25	86.2	24	82.8	3	10.3	93	1,197	1,161
Ontario	0	0.0	9	26.5	25	73.5	29	85.3	29	85.3	4	11.8	363	2,733	2,448
Southern Tier	0	0.0	18	24.0	53	70.7	64	85.3	66	88.0	7	9.3	227	6,802	6,913
Suffolk	0	0.0	21	32.8	48	75.0	60	93.8	60	93.8	2	3.1	1,151	16,088	15,907
Western	2	2.2	26	28.9	70	77.8	83	92.2	85	94.4	3	3.3	1,142	13,941	14,835
New York City	0	0.0	2	7.4	11	40.7	21	77.8	22	81.5	5	18.5	0	32,412	42,210
Total State	10	1.4%	233	32.1%	554	76.3%	652	89.8%	650	89.5%	51	7.0%	42,805	135,958	147,576

TABLE 6E

USE OF TEACHER OBSERVATION AS A READING RELATED DIAGNOSTIC DEVICE IN ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using Device at Grade Levels Indicated												Number of Students With Whom Device Was Used During 1974-75 at Grade Levels Indicated		
	Pre-K		K		1		2 - 3		4 - 6		Not Used				
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Pre-K - K	1 - 3	4 - 6
Capital District	12	12.6%	88	92.6%	89	93.7%	86	90.5%	85	89.5%	3	3.2%	8,828	27,798	27,653
Central	3	6.3	45	93.8	47	97.9	47	97.9	46	95.8	1	2.1	6,545	16,509	15,612
Central Western	8	11.8	64	94.1	66	97.1	66	97.1	65	95.6	2	2.9	9,809	32,215	31,576
Lower Hudson	8	14.0	54	94.7	55	96.5	57	100.0	56	98.2	0	0.0	8,566	30,198	31,431
Mid-Hudson	5	11.4	39	88.6	40	90.9	40	90.9	41	93.2	3	6.8	7,646	22,097	20,921
Mohawk	5	12.5	40	100.0	39	97.5	39	97.5	39	97.5	0	0.0	3,880	10,524	10,764
Nassau	20	36.4	49	89.1	52	94.5	52	94.5	51	92.7	3	5.5	11,952	28,673	30,908
Northeast	4	13.8	29	100.0	29	100.0	29	100.0	29	100.0	0	0.0	1,253	3,873	3,578
Ontario	1	2.9	33	97.1	34	100.0	34	100.0	34	100.0	0	0.0	2,093	8,460	8,509
Southern Tier	9	12.0	69	92.0	73	97.3	71	94.7	71	94.7	1	1.3	6,777	20,387	21,046
Suffolk	5	7.8	61	95.3	63	98.4	63	98.4	62	96.9	1	1.6	15,974	45,681	42,272
Western	11	12.2	82	91.1	87	96.7	87	96.7	87	96.7	1	1.1	13,324	41,687	44,711
New York City	5	18.5	23	85.2	23	85.2	25	92.6	26	96.3	1	3.7	12,217	50,858	64,899
Total State	96	13.2%	676	93.1%	697	96.0%	696	95.9%	692	95.3%	16	2.2%	108,864	338,960	353,880

TABLE 6F

USE OF TESTS OF MOTOR SKILLS AS READING RELATED DIAGNOSTIC DEVICES IN ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using Device at Grade Levels Indicated												Number of Students With Whom Device Was Used During 1974-75 at Grade Levels Indicated		
	Pre-K		K		1		2 - 3		4 - 6		Not Used				
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Pre-K - K	1 - 3	4 - 6
Capital District	13	13.7%	63	66.3%	49	51.6%	35	36.8%	26	27.4%	23	24.2%	6,432	6,699	5,801
Central	4	8.3	42	87.5	41	85.4	25	52.1	15	31.3	4	8.3	5,805	7,669	2,291
Central Western	15	22.1	52	76.5	50	73.5	34	50.0	24	35.3	11	16.2	7,086	7,267	4,730
Lower Hudson	15	26.3	48	84.2	44	77.2	40	70.2	35	61.4	3	5.3	12,182	6,885	6,301
Mid-Hudson	9	20.5	32	72.7	22	50.0	16	36.4	11	25.0	7	15.9	7,760	3,078	1,682
Mohawk	5	12.5	23	57.5	19	47.5	13	32.5	10	25.0	12	30.0	3,311	2,302	1,396
Nassau	19	34.5	45	81.8	40	72.7	28	50.9	22	40.0	6	10.9	10,630	9,523	9,836
Northeast	5	17.2	22	75.9	15	51.7	11	37.9	8	27.6	5	17.2	1,274	1,730	966
Ontario	8	23.5	29	85.3	24	70.6	18	52.9	14	41.2	3	8.8	2,123	3,046	2,018
Southern Tier	8	10.7	52	69.3	43	57.3	31	41.3	24	32.0	15	20.0	5,492	5,866	2,352
Suffolk	7	10.9	51	79.7	44	68.8	29	45.3	21	32.8	8	12.5	16,670	17,758	11,886
Western	22	24.4	69	76.7	57	63.3	37	41.1	28	31.1	14	15.6	11,767	19,469	9,286
New York City	1	3.7	13	48.1	11	40.7	10	37.0	7	25.9	10	37.0	6,622	20,030	12,010
Total State	131	18.0%	541	74.5%	459	63.2%	327	45.0%	245	33.7%	121	16.7%	97,154	111,322	70,555

TABLE 6G

USE OF VISION TESTS AS READING RELATED DIAGNOSTIC DEVICES
IN ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using Device at Grade Levels Indicated												Number of Students With Whom Device Was Used During 1974-75 at Grade Levels Indicated		
	Pre-K		K		1		2 - 3		4 - 6		Not Used				
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Pre-K - K	1 - 3	4 - 6
Capital District	17	17.9%	89	93.7%	87	91.6%	84	88.4%	80	84.2%	3	3.2%	11,759	31,162	31,420
Central	10	20.8	46	95.8	46	95.8	46	95.8	44	91.7	2	4.2	9,635	28,445	27,932
Central Western	11	16.2	64	94.1	63	92.6	65	95.6	61	89.7	2	2.9	14,586	41,472	44,685
Lower Hudson	13	22.8	50	87.7	53	93.0	51	89.5	48	84.2	3	5.3	14,105	28,204	29,170
Mid-Hudson	10	22.7	38	86.4	38	86.4	38	86.4	38	86.4	2	4.5	10,194	23,752	24,635
Mohawk	6	15.0	35	87.5	34	85.0	36	90.0	36	90.0	2	5.0	4,512	11,937	11,495
Nassau	20	36.4	52	94.5	51	92.7	52	94.5	52	94.5	3	5.5	16,789	45,844	50,824
Northeast	5	17.2	28	96.6	29	100.0	29	100.0	28	96.6	0	0.0	1,681	6,336	5,824
Ontario	9	26.5	32	94.1	32	94.1	32	94.1	31	91.2	1	2.9	2,685	11,125	11,246
Southern Tier	10	13.3	71	94.7	70	93.3	71	94.7	70	93.3	2	2.7	9,306	27,869	27,172
Suffolk	9	14.1	59	92.2	62	96.9	62	96.9	57	89.1	1	1.6	20,645	56,321	54,406
Western	19	21.1	83	92.2	84	93.3	82	91.1	82	91.1	4	4.4	15,907	43,210	46,106
New York City	3	11.1	23	85.2	24	88.9	26	96.3	26	96.3	1	3.7	23,436	106,714	113,961
Total State	142	19.6%	670	92.3%	673	92.7%	674	92.8%	653	89.9%	26	3.6%	155,240	462,391	478,876

TABLE 6H

USE OF HEARING TESTS AS READING RELATED DIAGNOSTIC DEVICES
IN ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using Device at Grade Levels Indicated												Number of Students With Whom Device Was Used During 1974-75 at Grade Levels Indicated		
	Pre-K		K		1		2 - 3		4 - 6		Not Used				
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Pre-K - K	1 - 3	4 - 6
Capital District	17	17.9%	88	92.6%	86	90.5%	82	86.3%	80	84.2%	4	4.2%	11,491	30,512	30,376
Central	10	20.8	46	95.8	45	93.8	45	93.8	43	89.6	2	4.2	9,444	28,130	27,047
Central Western	11	16.2	64	94.1	63	92.6	65	95.6	61	89.7	2	2.9	12,240	38,897	39,155
Lower Hudson	13	22.8	51	89.5	53	93.0	52	91.2	48	84.2	2	3.5	13,924	26,839	26,677
Mid-Hudson	10	22.7	38	86.4	38	86.4	38	86.4	38	86.4	2	4.5	9,818	21,369	22,272
Mohawk	6	15.0	35	87.5	35	87.5	36	90.0	36	90.0	2	5.0	4,514	11,907	11,450
Nassau	18	32.7	52	94.5	51	92.7	52	94.5	52	94.5	3	5.5	16,564	45,864	50,885
Northeast	4	13.8	28	96.6	27	93.1	28	96.6	26	89.7	1	3.4	1,630	6,250	5,663
Ontario	9	26.5	32	94.1	32	94.1	32	94.1	31	91.2	1	2.9	2,685	11,125	11,241
Southern Tier	10	13.3	72	96.0	70	93.3	71	94.7	70	93.3	2	2.7	9,397	26,268	26,931
Suffolk	5	7.8	58	90.6	62	96.9	62	96.9	60	93.8	1	1.6	16,663	56,339	54,110
Western	18	20.0	84	93.3	85	94.4	84	93.3	84	93.3	3	3.3	14,751	40,154	42,272
New York City	3	11.1	21	77.8	22	81.5	26	96.3	26	96.3	1	3.7	21,916	94,181	96,978
Total State	134	18.5%	669	92.1%	669	92.1%	673	92.7%	655	90.2%	26	3.6%	145,037	437,835	445,057

TABLE 61

USE OF LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT TESTS AS READING RELATED DIAGNOSTIC DEVICES IN ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using Device at Grade Levels Indicated												Number of Students With Whom Device Was Used During 1974-75 at Grade Levels Indicated		
	Pre-K		K		1		2 - 3		4 - 6		Not Used				
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Pre-K - K	1 - 3	4 - 6
Capital District	9	9.5%	48	50.5%	47	49.5%	41	43.2%	38	40.0%	28	29.5%	4,529	4,727	3,219
Central	8	16.7	33	68.8	29	60.4	21	43.8	15	31.3	10	20.8	4,973	3,667	1,600
Central Western	12	17.6	38	55.9	35	51.5	31	45.6	28	41.2	23	33.8	4,489	6,103	3,603
Lower Hudson	8	14.0	27	47.4	32	56.1	34	59.6	36	63.2	15	26.3	9,671	8,055	5,924
Mid-Hudson	9	20.5	27	61.4	21	47.7	20	45.5	21	47.7	9	20.5	7,193	4,721	5,789
Mohawk	3	7.5	11	27.5	13	32.5	12	30.0	11	27.5	23	57.5	1,233	1,223	1,040
Nassau	12	21.8	33	60.0	35	63.6	30	54.5	29	52.7	12	21.8	6,501	8,244	10,120
Northeast	2	6.9	17	58.6	16	55.2	15	51.7	16	55.2	8	27.6	809	574	482
Ontario	5	14.7	17	50.0	16	47.1	15	44.1	14	41.2	11	32.4	895	2,004	1,498
Southern Tier	5	6.7	30	40.0	26	34.7	28	37.3	21	28.0	35	46.7	3,407	4,755	2,918
Suffolk	3	4.7	33	51.6	42	65.6	36	56.3	33	51.6	15	23.4	9,545	17,012	12,760
Western	16	17.8	44	48.9	46	51.1	43	47.8	39	43.3	29	32.2	4,646	10,302	8,471
New York City	3	11.1	12	44.4	14	51.9	11	40.7	11	40.7	11	40.7	5,157	16,946	23,115
Total State	95	13.1%	370	51.0%	372	51.2%	337	46.4%	312	43.0%	229	31.5%	63,048	88,333	80,539

TABLE 6J

USE OF "OTHER" READING RELATED DIAGNOSTIC DEVICES
IN ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using Device at Grade Levels Indicated												Number of Students With Whom Device Was Used During 1974-75 at Grade Levels Indicated		
	Pre-K		K		1		2 - 3		4 - 6		Not Used				
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Pre-K -K	1 - 3	4 - 6
Capital District	2	2.1%	7	7.4%	16	16.8%	22	23.2%	18	18.9%	69	72.6%	612	3,442	2,799
Central	2	4.2	5	10.4	8	16.7	9	18.8	10	20.8	35	72.9	782	4,728	5,789
Central Western	3	4.4	10	14.7	13	19.1	14	20.6	16	23.5	51	75.0	2,555	14,306	14,172
Lower Hudson	2	3.5	8	14.0	11	19.3	14	24.6	16	28.1	38	66.7	1,921	4,897	5,339
Mid-Hudson	3	6.8	5	11.4	6	13.6	5	11.4	4	9.1	34	77.3	644	4,973	5,094
Mohawk	0	0.0	2	5.0	2	5.0	3	7.5	3	7.5	37	92.5	30	955	870
Nassau	4	7.3	11	20.0	10	18.2	14	25.5	14	25.5	34	61.8	1,437	4,194	5,058
Northeast	0	0.0	3	10.3	6	20.7	7	24.1	5	17.2	22	75.9	31	180	21
Ontario	0	0.0	3	8.8	5	14.7	6	17.6	6	17.6	27	79.4	197	1,041	1,130
Southern Tier	2	2.7	8	10.7	12	16.0	11	14.7	9	12.0	60	80.0	969	2,269	2,203
Suffolk	1	1.6	9	14.1	13	20.3	14	21.9	13	20.3	46	71.9	1,004	4,683	4,006
Western	1	1.1	17	18.9	24	26.7	26	28.9	27	30.0	60	66.7	1,379	6,252	6,444
New York City	0	0.0	5	18.5	5	18.5	6	22.2	6	22.2	19	70.4	1,495	10,750	18,577
Total State	20	2.8%	93	12.8%	131	18.0%	151	20.8%	147	20.2%	532	73.3%	13,056	62,670	71,502

TABLE 7

USE OF INFORMATION FROM READING RELATED DIAGNOSTIC DEVICES
IN ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Which Differentiate Reading Instruction Based on Information From Diagnostic Devices in Grades:					
	Pre-K - K		1 - 3		4 - 6	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	42	44.2%	93	97.9%	90	94.7%
Central	26	54.2	44	91.7	45	93.8
Central Western	33	48.5	64	94.1	64	94.1
Lower Hudson	37	64.9	56	98.2	57	100.0
Mid-Hudson	22	50.0	41	93.2	41	93.2
Mohawk	24	60.0	40	100.0	35	87.5
Nassau	34	61.8	51	92.7	50	90.9
Northeast	13	44.8	29	100.0	28	96.6
Ontario	16	47.1	34	100.0	34	100.0
Southern Tier	30	40.0	74	98.7	71	94.7
Suffolk	33	51.6	63	98.4	63	98.4
Western	44	48.9	89	98.9	87	96.7
New York City	13	48.1	24	88.9	25	92.6
Total State	367	50.6%	702	96.7%	690	95.0%

TABLE 8

PRACTICES FOR DIFFERENTIATING READING INSTRUCTION
IN ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS
BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE
1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Differentiating Instruction by:							
	Individual Programming		Grouping By Instructional Level		Grouping By Learning Rate		Other Methods	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	64	67.4%	92	96.8%	56	58.9%	15	15.8%
Central	39	81.3	46	95.8	35	72.9	9	18.8
Central Western	55	80.9	66	97.1	50	73.5	13	19.1
Lower Hudson	52	91.2	52	91.2	33	57.9	18	31.6
Mid-Hudson	33	75.0	40	90.9	25	56.8	9	20.5
Mohawk	33	82.5	39	97.5	24	60.0	9	22.5
Nassau	49	89.1	52	94.5	35	63.6	14	25.5
Northeast	20	69.0	27	93.1	16	55.2	4	13.8
Ontario	23	67.6	32	94.1	15	44.1	2	5.9
Southern Tier	55	73.3	71	94.7	44	58.7	7	9.3
Suffolk	56	87.5	62	96.9	43	67.2	15	23.4
Western	68	75.6	86	95.6	50	55.6	21	23.3
New York City	18	66.7	26	96.3	7	25.9	4	14.8
Total State	565	77.8%	691	95.2%	433	59.6%	140	19.3%

TABLE 9

APPROACHES FOR TEACHING READING IN ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS
BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE
1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using:											
	Phonics		i/t/a		Linguistic Approach		Language Experience		Programmed Learning		Other Approach	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	95	100.0%	2	2.1%	66	69.5%	87	91.6%	58	61.1%	27	28.4%
Central	47	97.9	3	6.3	33	68.8	44	91.7	27	56.3	16	33.3
Central Western	67	98.5	3	4.4	54	79.4	56	82.4	34	50.0	20	29.4
Lower Hudson	55	96.5	2	3.5	49	86.0	52	91.2	45	78.9	25	43.9
Mid-Hudson	41	93.2	6	13.6	31	70.5	33	75.0	28	63.6	17	38.6
Mohawk	39	97.5	2	5.0	22	55.0	36	90.0	19	47.5	10	25.0
Nassau	52	94.5	6	10.9	46	83.6	52	94.5	36	65.5	20	36.4
Northeast	27	93.1	1	3.4	16	55.2	18	62.1	15	51.7	7	24.1
Ontario	33	97.1	0	0.0	19	55.9	22	64.7	17	50.0	5	14.7
Southern Tier	74	98.7	5	6.7	43	57.3	63	84.0	40	53.3	21	28.0
Suffolk	63	98.4	8	12.5	54	84.4	57	89.1	38	59.4	21	32.8
Western	87	96.7	7	7.8	60	66.7	76	84.4	49	54.4	18	20.0
New York City	26	96.3	3	11.1	26	96.3	24	88.9	18	66.7	11	40.7
Total State	706	97.2%	48	6.6%	519	71.5%	620	85.4%	424	58.4%	218	30.0%

TABLE 10

BASAL READERS USED IN ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using:											
	Allyn and Bacon, Inc.		American Book Company		Ginn and Company		i/t/a		Holt, Rinehart and Winston		Houghton Mifflin Company	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	11	11.6%	20	21.1%	45	47.4%	1	1.1%	21	22.1%	61	64.2%
Central	9	18.8	16	33.3	27	56.3	2	4.2	9	18.8	33	68.8
Central Western	16	23.5	17	25.0	42	61.8	3	4.4	22	32.4	43	63.2
Lower Hudson	21	36.8	33	57.9	40	70.2	1	1.8	29	50.9	40	70.2
Mid-Hudson	11	25.0	13	29.5	32	72.7	5	11.4	8	18.2	20	45.5
Mohawk	4	10.0	11	27.5	13	32.5	1	2.5	6	15.0	25	62.5
Nassau	20	36.4	31	56.4	37	67.3	5	9.1	15	27.3	33	60.0
Northeast	0	0.0	10	34.5	18	62.1	1	3.4	3	10.3	19	65.5
Ontario	4	11.8	10	29.4	10	29.4	0	0.0	4	11.8	18	52.9
Southern Tier	9	12.0	15	20.0	34	45.3	4	5.3	13	17.3	49	65.3
Suffolk	14	21.9	33	51.6	40	62.5	8	12.5	18	28.1	44	68.8
Western	20	22.2	27	30.0	53	58.9	7	7.8	24	26.7	51	56.7
New York City	19	70.4	25	92.6	25	92.6	2	7.4	21	77.8	25	92.6
Total State	158	21.8%	261	36.0%	416	57.3%	40	5.5%	193	26.6%	461	63.5%

(Concluded)

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using:									
	Lippincott		Macmillan		Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc.		Scott, Foresman, and Company		Other Basal Readers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	23	24.2%	29	30.5%	27	28.4%	58	61.1%	47	49.5%
Central	11	22.9	21	43.8	12	25.0	31	64.6	27	56.3
Central Western	19	27.9	17	25.0	15	22.1	47	69.1	26	38.2
Lower Hudson	39	68.4	38	66.7	34	59.6	42	73.7	36	63.2
Mid-Hudson	17	38.6	21	47.7	16	36.4	33	75.0	25	56.8
Mohawk	12	30.0	14	35.0	3	7.5	28	70.0	17	42.5
Nassau	22	40.0	36	65.5	20	36.4	47	85.5	29	52.7
Northeast	8	27.6	3	10.3	10	34.5	20	69.0	17	58.6
Ontario	4	11.8	5	14.7	4	11.8	17	50.0	15	44.1
Southern Tier	18	24.0	15	20.0	11	14.7	53	70.7	31	41.3
Suffolk	28	43.8	36	56.3	21	32.8	50	78.1	36	56.3
Western	17	18.9	40	44.4	14	15.6	63	70.0	36	40.0
New York City	25	92.6	24	88.9	22	81.5	24	88.9	14	51.9
Total State	243	33.5%	299	41.2%	209	28.8%	513	70.7%	356	49.0%

TABLE 11

METHODS OF SELECTION OF BASAL READERS FOR ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using:											
	District-wide Selection of:						School-wide Selection of:					
	Single Basal		Co-basals		Multi-basals		Single Basal		Co-basals		Multi-basals	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	32	33.7%	11	11.6%	14	14.7%	21	22.1%	12	12.6%	19	20.0%
Central	9	18.8	10	20.8	16	33.3	12	25.0	10	20.8	10	20.8
Central Western	18	26.5	8	11.8	14	20.6	17	25.0	9	13.2	21	30.9
Lower Hudson	8	14.0	5	8.8	13	22.8	8	14.0	6	10.5	28	49.1
Mid-Hudson	7	15.9	6	13.6	10	22.7	7	15.9	4	9.1	17	38.6
Mohawk	15	37.5	7	17.5	8	20.0	18	45.0	9	22.5	6	15.0
Nassau	16	29.1	6	10.9	15	27.3	10	18.2	13	23.6	23	41.8
Northeast	10	34.5	6	20.7	4	13.8	2	6.9	4	13.8	5	17.2
Ontario	14	41.2	9	26.5	7	20.6	4	11.8	6	17.6	6	17.6
Southern Tier	27	36.0	8	10.7	13	17.3	19	25.3	8	10.7	13	17.3
Suffolk	14	21.9	7	10.9	20	31.3	12	18.8	13	20.3	26	40.6
Western	19	21.1	19	21.1	22	24.4	17	18.9	7	7.8	32	35.6
New York City	0	0.0	1	3.7	1	3.7	18	66.7	14	51.9	24	88.9
Total State	189	26.0%	103	14.2%	157	21.6%	165	22.7%	115	15.8%	230	31.7%

TABLE 11

METHODS OF SELECTION OF BASAL READERS FOR ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

(Concluded)

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using:													
	Grade-wide Selection of:						Individual Teacher Selection of:						Other Methods of Selections	
	Single Basal		Co-basals		Multi-basals		Single Basal		Co-basals		Multi-basals			
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	7	7.4%	9	9.5%	16	16.8%	8	8.4%	10	10.5%	16	16.8%	10	10.5%
Central	5	10.4	6	12.5	7	14.6	5	10.4	3	6.3	5	10.4	9	18.8
Central Western	7	10.3	5	7.4	17	25.0	10	14.7	7	10.3	23	33.8	6	8.8
Lower Hudson	9	15.8	7	12.3	18	31.6	11	19.3	10	17.5	25	43.9	9	15.8
Mid-Hudson	1	2.3	2	4.5	4	9.1	4	9.1	4	9.1	9	20.5	6	13.6
Mohawk	2	5.0	4	10.0	3	7.5	2	5.0	7	17.5	8	20.0	5	12.5
Nassau	8	14.5	7	12.7	18	32.7	13	23.6	16	29.1	20	36.4	7	12.7
Northeast	2	6.9	2	6.9	3	10.3	7	24.1	5	17.2	8	27.6	2	6.9
Ontario	0	0.0	2	5.9	3	8.8	2	5.9	1	2.9	4	11.8	1	2.9
Southern Tier	4	5.3	5	6.7	9	12.0	3	4.0	9	12.0	10	13.3	5	6.7
Suffolk	7	10.9	10	15.6	18	28.1	7	10.9	8	12.5	23	[illegible]	13	20.3
Western	2	2.2	1	1.1	11	12.2	7	7.8	2	2.2	13	14.4	10	11.1
New York City	10	37.0	13	48.1	13	48.1	17	63.0	9	33.3	13	48.1	1	3.7
Total State	64	8.8%	73	10.1%	140	19.3%	96	13.2%	91	12.5%	177	24.4%	84	11.6%

TABLE 12

USE OF SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS IN ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using:									
	Supplementary Tests		Supplementary Activity Workbooks and/or Sheets		Film Strips		Tapes		Laboratory Kits	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	93	97.9%	92	96.8%	91	95.8%	91	95.8%	87	91.6%
Central	46	95.8	47	97.9	46	95.8	47	97.9	45	93.8
Central Western	64	94.1	67	98.5	64	94.1	65	95.6	61	89.7
Lower Hudson	55	96.5	56	98.2	54	94.7	56	98.2	55	96.5
Mid-Hudson	39	88.6	42	95.5	41	93.2	42	95.5	39	88.6
Mohawk	38	95.0	38	95.0	36	90.0	36	90.0	33	82.5
Nassau	52	94.5	52	94.5	51	92.7	49	89.1	50	90.9
Northeast	26	89.7	29	100.0	27	93.1	27	93.1	24	82.8
Ontario	33	97.1	33	97.1	31	91.2	28	82.4	28	82.4
Southern Tier	74	98.7	74	98.7	72	96.0	72	96.0	64	85.3
Suffolk	63	98.4	64	100.0	62	96.9	58	90.6	56	87.5
Western	86	95.6	89	98.9	88	97.8	87	96.7	81	90.0
New York City	25	92.6	26	96.3	25	92.6	24	88.9	25	92.6
Total State	694	95.6%	709	97.7%	688	94.8%	682	93.9%	648	89.3%

(Concluded)

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using:											
	Tachistoscopic Devices		Reading Pacers		Game Techniques		Muscular Coordination Devices		Programs Designed to Improve Visual Perception		Other Supplementary Materials	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	68	71.6%	53	55.8%	90	94.7%	54	56.8%	72	75.8%	20	21.1%
Central	34	70.8	30	62.5	45	93.8	32	66.7	43	89.6	14	29.2
Central Western	41	60.3	37	54.4	64	94.1	43	63.2	60	88.2	17	25.0
Lower Hudson	43	75.4	43	75.4	55	96.5	40	70.2	49	86.0	13	22.8
Mid-Hudson	36	81.8	31	70.5	39	88.6	32	72.7	37	84.1	9	20.5
Mohawk	28	70.0	25	62.5	38	95.0	19	47.5	27	67.5	12	30.0
Nassau	46	83.6	40	72.7	52	94.5	39	70.9	47	85.5	13	23.6
Northeast	19	65.5	16	55.2	27	93.1	16	55.2	24	82.8	5	17.2
Ontario	22	64.7	14	41.2	32	94.1	20	58.8	24	70.6	8	23.5
Southern Tier	50	66.7	44	58.7	71	94.7	46	61.3	60	80.0	22	29.3
Suffolk	48	75.0	44	68.8	62	96.9	46	71.9	56	87.5	12	18.8
Western	67	74.4	55	61.1	88	97.8	50	55.6	71	78.9	25	27.8
New York City	21	77.8	20	74.1	25	92.6	15	55.6	21	77.8	1	3.7
Total State	523	72.0%	452	62.3%	688	94.8%	452	62.3%	591	81.4%	171	23.6%

TABLE 13

AUXILIARY SERVICES FOR ELEMENTARY READING PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Incorporating the Following Services With the Reading Program													
	Psychological Services		Social Services		Guidance Services		Physical Education		Paraprofessional Services		Speech Services		Other Services	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	88	92.6%	17	17.9%	57	60.0%	55	57.9%	74	77.9%	78	82.1%	35	36.8%
Central	47	97.9	25	52.1	37	77.1	37	77.1	40	83.3	45	93.8	19	39.6
Central Western	67	98.5	22	32.4	42	61.8	46	67.6	50	73.5	63	92.6	26	38.2
Lower Hudson	54	94.7	23	40.4	35	61.4	40	70.2	46	80.7	50	87.7	24	42.1
Mid-Hudson	40	90.9	18	40.9	26	59.1	26	59.1	31	70.5	41	93.2	18	40.9
Mohawk	38	95.0	16	40.0	24	60.0	25	62.5	31	77.5	34	85.0	12	30.0
Nassau	47	85.5	25	45.5	28	50.9	37	67.3	34	61.8	47	85.5	25	45.5
Northeast	25	86.2	8	27.6	16	55.2	19	65.5	21	72.4	22	75.9	5	17.2
Ontario	32	94.1	10	29.4	16	47.1	23	67.6	27	79.4	28	82.4	9	26.5
Southern Tier	64	85.3	11	14.7	47	62.7	43	57.3	65	86.7	62	82.7	22	29.3
Suffolk	57	89.1	30	46.9	37	57.8	43	67.2	62	81.3	57	89.1	28	43.8
Western	87	96.7	23	25.6	52	57.8	59	65.6	72	80.0	81	90.0	34	37.8
New York City	15	55.6	8	29.6	22	81.5	5	18.5	25	92.6	19	70.4	5	18.5
Total State	661	91.0%	236	32.5%	439	60.5%	458	63.1%	568	78.2%	627	86.4%	262	36.1%

TABLE 14

RESPONSIBILITY FOR ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION OF THE ELEMENTARY READING PROGRAM

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts in Which Responsibility is Delegated To:									
	Deputy, Associate, or Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education, Curriculum, or Instruction		Director or Coordinator of Early Childhood Education		Director or Coordinator of Elementary Education, Curriculum, or Instruction		Principal		Assistant Principal	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	11	11.6%	0	0.0%	10	10.5%	35	36.8%	2	2.1%
Central	9	18.8	0	0.0	7	14.6	18	37.5	0	0.0
Central Western	4	5.9	0	0.0	3	4.4	44	64.7	0	0.0
Lower Hudson	9	15.8	0	0.0	10	17.5	21	36.8	0	0.0
Mid-Hudson	6	13.6	0	0.0	3	6.8	18	40.9	0	0.0
Mohawk	2	5.0	0	0.0	4	10.0	18	45.0	2	5.0
Nassau	15	27.3	0	0.0	3	5.5	16	29.1	0	0.0
Northeast	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.4	19	65.5	0	0.0
Ontario	2	5.9	0	0.0	10	29.4	8	23.5	1	2.9
Southern Tier	4	5.3	0	0.0	6	8.0	32	42.7	3	4.0
Suffolk	16	25.0	0	0.0	5	7.8	18	28.1	2	3.1
Western	7	7.8	0	0.0	12	13.3	43	47.8	1	1.1
New York City	5	18.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	13	48.1	0	0.0
Total State	90	12.4%	0	0.0%	74	10.2%	303	41.7%	11	1.5%

TABLE 14

RESPONSIBILITY FOR ADMINSTRATION AND SUPERVISION OF THE

ELEMENTARY READING PROGRAM

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

(Concluded)

Region	Number and Percent of Districts in Which Responsibility is Delegated To:											
	Prekindergarten, Kindergarten, Early Childhood Education, or Common Branch (1-6) Supervisor		Reading Director, Coordinator, or Supervisor		Reading Department Head or Chairman		English or Language Arts Department Head or Chairman		Reading Consultant or Specialist		"Other"	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	4	4.2%	17	17.9%	1	1.1%	1	1.1%	5	5.3%	9	9.5%
Central	0	0.0	11	22.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	2	4.2
Central Western	0	0.0	14	20.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.5	2	2.9
Lower Hudson	0	0.0	7	12.3	1	1.8	1	1.8	5	8.8	3	5.3
Mid-Hudson	0	0.0	6	13.6	1	2.3	2	4.5	4	9.1	4	9.1
Mohawk	0	0.0	9	22.5	1	2.5	0	0.0	2	5.0	2	5.0
Nassau	0	0.0	11	20.0	1	1.8	0	0.0	2	3.6	7	12.7
Northeast	0	0.0	4	13.8	1	3.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	13.8
Ontario	2	5.9	3	8.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	8.8	5	14.7
Southern Tier	2	2.7	16	21.3	0	0.0	1	1.3	6	8.0	5	6.7
Suffolk	0	0.0	14	21.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.6	8	12.5
Western	0	0.0	18	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	4.4	5	5.6
New York City	0	0.0	2	7.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.7	6	22.2
Total State	8	1.1%	132	18.2%	6	0.8%	5	0.7%	35	4.8%	62	8.5%

TABLE 15

INSTRUMENTS USED TO EVALUATE THE ELEMENTARY READING PROGRAM

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using:									
	Mastery Testing of Selected Objectives		Achievement Tests		Reading Survey Tests		Basal Reader End of Level Tests		Other Instruments	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	50	52.6%	92	96.8%	71	74.7%	85	89.5%	20	21.1%
Central	32	66.7	45	93.8	30	62.5	43	89.6	16	33.3
Central Western	34	50.0	65	95.6	47	69.1	61	89.7	14	20.6
Lower Hudson	42	73.7	56	98.2	37	64.9	44	77.2	20	35.1
Mid-Hudson	20	45.5	40	90.9	30	68.2	37	84.1	8	18.2
Mohawk	23	57.5	39	97.5	28	70.0	34	85.0	9	22.5
Nassau	28	50.9	50	90.9	37	67.3	39	70.9	21	38.2
Northeast	11	37.9	28	96.6	21	72.4	28	96.6	6	20.7
Ontario	12	35.3	28	82.4	20	58.8	31	91.2	8	23.5
Southern Tier	28	37.3	71	94.7	51	68.0	65	86.7	12	16.0
Suffolk	37	57.8	62	96.9	43	67.2	48	75.0	19	29.7
Western	40	44.4	88	97.8	61	67.8	76	84.4	17	18.9
New York City	15	55.6	26	96.3	14	51.9	15	55.6	5	18.5
Total State	372	51.2%	690	95.0%	490	67.5%	606	83.5%	175	24.1%

TABLE 16

SOURCES OF MASTERY TESTING OF SELECTED OBJECTIVES

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent[a] of Districts Using:									
	Commercial Management Systems		SPPED-CAM Systems		District Developed Objectives and Tests		Building Developed Objectives and Tests		Other Sources	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	31	62.0%	1	2.0%	15	30.0%	8	16.0%	12	24.0%
Central	20	62.5	9	28.1	17	53.1	8	25.0	6	18.8
Central Western	22	64.7	4	11.8	16	47.0	4	11.8	3	8.8
Lower Hudson	28	66.7	0	0.0	13	31.0	15	35.7	15	35.7
Mid-Hudson	11	55.0	1	5.0	2	10.0	5	25.0	5	25.0
Mohawk	19	82.6	2	8.7	5	21.7	3	13.0	2	8.7
Nassau	14	50.0	3	10.7	20	71.4	7	25.0	8	28.6
Northeast	6	54.5	0	0.0	1	9.1	2	18.2	5	45.4
Ontario	5	41.7	1	8.3	4	33.3	1	8.3	3	25.0
Southern Tier	11	39.3	3	10.7	7	25.0	6	21.4	11	39.3
Suffolk	13	35.1	4	10.8	17	45.9	14	37.8	8	21.6
Western	22	55.0	4	10.0	15	37.5	11	27.5	11	27.5
New York City	7	46.7	1	6.7	1	6.7	8	53.3	8	53.3
Total State	209	56.2%	33	8.9%	133	35.8%	92	24.7%	97	26.1%

[a]Percents are based on number of districts using mastery testing.

TABLE 17

UTILIZATION OF STANDARDIZED READING ACHIEVEMENT TESTS

IN ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Administering:											
	Metropolitan Achievement Tests		Stanford Achievement Tests		Iowa Tests of Basic Skills		California Achievement Tests		SRA Achievement Tests		Other Achievement Tests	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	58	61.1%	37	38.9%	43	45.3%	15	15.8%	11	11.6%	33	34.7%
Central	19	39.6	18	37.5	23	47.9	9	18.8	4	8.3	17	35.4
Central Western	42	61.8	33	48.5	29	42.6	11	16.2	11	16.2	16	23.5
Lower Hudson	25	43.9	28	49.1	16	28.1	10	17.5	6	10.5	27	47.4
Mid-Hudson	19	43.2	15	34.1	18	40.9	6	13.6	4	9.1	12	27.3
Mohawk	16	40.0	7	17.5	26	65.0	7	17.5	3	7.5	13	32.5
Nassau	32	58.2	33	60.0	12	21.8	12	21.8	7	12.7	22	40.0
Northeast	14	48.3	14	48.3	15	51.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	37.9
Ontario	20	58.8	11	32.4	18	52.9	3	8.8	5	14.7	6	17.6
Southern Tier	35	46.7	30	40.0	34	45.3	13	17.3	4	5.3	25	33.3
Suffolk	34	53.1	27	42.2	14	21.9	12	18.8	6	9.4	16	25.0
Western	55	61.1	34	37.8	34	37.8	13	14.4	5	5.6	26	28.9
New York City	15	55.6	22	81.5	1	3.7	6	22.2	3	11.1	9	33.3
Total State	384	52.9%	309	42.6%	283	39.0%	117	16.1%	69	9.5%	233	32.1%

TABLE 18

UTILIZATION OF READING SURVEY TESTS IN ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number of Students Administered:			
	Gates Reading Survey Test	Developmental Reading Tests	Durrell-Sullivan Reading Capacity and Achievement Test	Gates Primary Reading Tests
Capital District	917	15,238	808	413
Central	2,185	22,231	123	1,040
Central Western	2,850	17,132	350	473
Lower Hudson	2,357	14,785	415	674
Mid-Hudson	471	16,019	246	1,688
Mohawk	1,084	4,192	309	174
Nassau	1,256	23,701	1,004	1,092
Northeast	925	1,140	1,155	351
Ontario	15	6,094	215	113
Southern Tier	540	20,775	851	803
Suffolk	708	24,244	916	1,979
Western	1,882	30,010	1,185	905
New York City	110	15,000	630	0
Total State	15,300	210,561	8,207	9,705

(Concluded)

Region	Number of Students Administered:			
	Gates Advanced Primary Reading Tests	Gates Basic Reading Tests - Elementary	Gates MacGinitie Reading Test	Other Reading Survey Tests
Capital District	80	770	13,353	9,687
Central	50	200	22,039	6,915
Central Western	292	135	25,579	8,356
Lower Hudson	640	605	17,117	12,642
Mid-Hudson	656	215	16,675	6,368
Mohawk	0	180	6,157	12,551
Nassau	887	135	6,097	10,468
Northeast	0	0	2,099	2,240
Ontario	126	190	7,603	3,579
Southern Tier	358	300	10,093	8,026
Suffolk	1,121	1,402	43,668	12,628
Western	710	1,615	32,399	18,688
New York City	0	0	100	27,589
Total State	4,920	5,747	202,979	139,737

TABLE 19

64

INFORMATION SUBMITTED TO THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL
FROM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL READING PROGRAMS
BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE
1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Submitting:									
	Highest Levels of Materials in Reading Completed By Each Student		Individual Reading Test Scores		Group Reading Test Scores For the Student		Checklist of Skills Mastered By the Student		Other Information	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	73	76.8%	84	88.4%	82	86.3%	39	41.1%	16	16.8%
Central	44	91.7	43	89.6	42	87.5	30	62.5	13	27.1
Central Western	60	88.2	62	91.2	59	86.8	29	42.6	21	30.9
Lower Hudson	43	75.4	50	87.7	48	84.2	37	64.9	16	28.1
Mid-Hudson	38	86.4	36	81.8	38	86.4	23	52.3	11	25.0
Mohawk	33	82.5	36	90.0	37	92.5	17	42.5	10	25.0
Nassau	35	63.6	42	76.4	49	89.1	26	47.3	13	23.6
Northeast	23	79.3	25	86.2	23	79.3	9	31.0	7	24.1
Ontario	28	82.4	31	91.2	23	67.6	8	23.5	9	26.5
Southern Tier	57	76.0	68	90.7	59	78.7	24	32.0	10	13.3
Suffolk	56	87.5	62	96.9	52	81.3	34	53.1	20	31.3
Western	79	87.8	78	86.7	72	80.0	37	41.1	18	20.0
New York City	12	44.4	20	74.1	19	70.4	12	44.4	1	3.7
Total State	581	80.0%	637	87.7%	603	83.1%	325	44.8%	165	22.7%

TABLE 20

UTILIZATION OF INFORMATION FROM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TO DETERMINE PUPIL PLACEMENT IN SECONDARY SCHOOL READING PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using:									
	Highest Levels of Materials in Reading Completed By Each Student		Individual Reading Test Scores		Group Reading Test Scores For the Student		Checklist of Skills Mastered By the Student		Other Information	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	53	55.8%	71	74.7%	69	72.6%	29	30.5%	17	17.9%
Central	36	75.0	39	81.3	40	83.3	22	45.8	16	33.3
Central Western	41	60.3	54	79.4	54	79.4	26	38.2	25	36.8
Lower Hudson	28	49.1	40	70.2	47	82.5	28	49.1	18	31.6
Mid-Hudson	28	63.6	31	70.5	32	72.7	16	36.4	6	13.6
Mohawk	21	52.5	31	77.5	30	75.0	9	22.5	9	22.5
Nassau	26	47.3	31	56.4	39	70.9	24	43.6	19	34.5
Northeast	13	44.8	16	55.2	19	65.5	3	10.3	7	24.1
Ontario	24	70.6	27	79.4	27	79.4	12	35.3	10	29.4
Southern Tier	41	54.7	54	72.0	54	72.0	15	20.0	18	24.0
Suffolk	43	67.2	49	76.6	42	65.6	22	34.4	24	37.5
Western	60	66.7	72	80.0	68	75.6	34	37.8	26	28.9
New York City	6	22.2	14	51.9	19	70.4	2	7.4	6	22.2
Total State	420	57.9%	529	72.9%	540	74.4%	242	33.3%	201	27.7%

TABLE 21

PRACTICES FOR DIFFERENTIATING READING INSTRUCTION
IN SECONDARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Differentiating Instruction by:							
	Individualized Learning Packages		Instruction in Multi-level Materials		Differentiated Pacing		Other Methods	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	41	43.2%	70	73.7%	56	58.9%	10	10.5%
Central	29	60.4	43	89.6	36	75.0	10	20.8
Central Western	34	50.0	55	80.9	44	64.7	13	19.1
Lower Hudson	41	71.9	47	82.5	34	59.6	14	24.6
Mid-Hudson	22	50.0	34	77.3	30	68.2	6	13.6
Mohawk	15	37.5	33	82.5	23	57.5	6	15.0
Nassau	32	58.2	40	72.7	37	67.3	8	14.5
Northeast	10	34.5	19	65.5	12	41.4	3	10.3
Ontario	15	44.1	30	88.2	21	61.8	5	14.7
Southern Tier	30	40.0	63	84.0	42	56.0	9	12.0
Suffolk	31	48.4	50	78.1	34	53.1	13	20.3
Western	38	42.2	73	81.1	55	61.1	15	16.7
New York City	18	66.7	25	92.6	19	70.4	1	3.7
Total State	356	49.0%	582	80.2%	443	61.0%	113	15.6%

TABLE 22

ASSISTANCE FOR SUBJECT MATTER TEACHERS
TO HELP STUDENTS READING BELOW GRADE LEVEL
IN SECONDARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts With:							
	Assistance in Improving Reading Skills Within the Classroom Setting		Provision of Study Guides for Vocabulary Improvement and Comprehension Development		Rewritten Materials in Content Areas at Easy-to-Read Levels		Cycled In-service Courses in Reading	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	50	52.6%	31	32.6%	16	16.8%	13	13.7%
Central	37	77.1	31	64.6	19	39.6	22	45.8
Central Western	44	64.7	26	38.2	21	30.9	17	25.0
Lower Hudson	45	78.9	34	59.6	24	42.1	11	19.3
Mid-Hudson	29	65.9	18	40.9	12	27.3	13	29.5
Mohawk	24	60.0	13	32.5	12	30.0	11	27.5
Nassau	37	67.3	31	56.4	21	38.2	18	32.7
Northeast	12	41.4	6	20.7	8	27.6	0	0.0
Ontario	20	58.8	7	20.6	6	17.6	8	23.5
Southern Tier	44	58.7	24	32.0	19	25.3	8	10.7
Suffolk	45	70.3	31	48.4	19	29.7	16	25.0
Western	55	61.1	34	37.8	21	23.3	20	22.2
New York City	24	88.9	20	74.1	10	37.0	5	18.5
Total State	466	64.2%	306	42.1%	208	28.7%	162	22.3%

(Concluded)

Region	Number and Percent of Districts With:					
	Multi-level Supplementary Materials		Other Assistance		No Special Assistance	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	57	60.0%	16	16.8%	11	11.6%
Central	38	79.2	9	18.8	4	8.3
Central Western	44	64.7	20	29.4	5	7.4
Lower Hudson	41	71.9	18	31.6	2	3.5
Mid-Hudson	30	68.2	11	25.0	6	13.6
Mohawk	28	70.0	9	22.5	4	10.0
Nassau	37	67.3	14	25.5	3	5.5
Northeast	18	62.1	6	20.7	7	24.1
Ontario	23	67.6	9	26.5	5	14.7
Southern Tier	51	68.0	13	17.3	10	13.3
Suffolk	41	64.1	16	25.0	2	3.1
Western	61	67.8	20	22.2	9	10.0
New York City	22	81.5	5	18.5	0	0.0
Total State	491	67.6%	166	22.9%	68	9.4%

TABLE 23

ARRANGEMENTS FOR IMPROVING READING SKILLS OF SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS
READING TWO OR MORE YEARS BELOW GRADE PLACEMENT
BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE
1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using:											
	Mandatory Lab Instruction		Voluntary Lab Instruction		Small Group Corrective Sessions, Scheduled Regularly		Individual Corrective Sessions, Scheduled Regularly		Other Assistance		No Supplementary Assistance	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	36	37.9%	29	30.5%	70	73.7%	41	43.2%	14	14.7%	5	5.3%
Central	26	54.2	23	47.9	40	83.3	28	58.3	11	22.9	3	6.3
Central Western	28	41.2	23	33.8	54	79.4	44	64.7	15	22.1	3	4.4
Lower Hudson	27	47.4	23	40.4	48	84.2	37	64.9	15	26.3	1	1.8
Mid-Hudson	15	34.1	13	29.5	33	75.0	18	40.9	11	25.0	3	6.8
Mohawk	9	22.5	10	25.0	32	80.0	21	52.5	8	20.0	0	0.0
Nassau	22	40.0	25	45.5	42	76.4	23	41.8	11	20.0	1	1.8
Northeast	9	31.0	3	10.3	18	62.1	12	41.4	5	17.2	7	24.1
Ontario	10	29.4	11	32.4	30	88.2	18	52.9	8	23.5	2	5.9
Southern Tier	23	30.7	18	24.0	50	66.7	36	48.0	8	10.7	8	10.7
Suffolk	30	46.9	25	39.1	43	67.2	29	45.3	15	23.4	2	3.1
Western	32	35.6	32	35.6	73	81.1	44	48.9	13	14.4	2	2.2
New York City	14	51.9	3	11.1	25	92.6	16	59.3	1	3.7	0	0.0
Total State	281	38.7%	238	32.8%	558	76.9%	367	50.6%	135	18.6%	37	5.1%

TABLE 24

USE OF STANDARDIZED READING TESTS FOR SECONDARY READING PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Administering:							
	California Reading		Cooperative English Tests Reading Comprehension		Davis Reading		Iowa Silent Reading	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	17	17.9%	2	2.1%	1	1.1%	12	12.6%
Central	11	22.9	5	10.4	0	0.0	7	14.6
Central Western	11	16.2	5	7.4	2	2.9	11	16.2
Lower Hudson	13	22.8	8	14.0	3	5.3	11	19.3
Mid-Hudson	6	13.6	2	4.5	1	2.3	9	20.5
Mohawk	5	12.5	3	7.5	0	0.0	3	7.5
Nassau	12	21.8	17	30.9	1	1.8	6	10.9
Northeast	3	10.3	0	0.0	1	3.4	2	6.9
Ontario	6	17.6	2	5.9	0	0.0	6	17.6
Southern Tier	11	14.7	2	2.7	0	0.0	10	13.3
Suffolk	12	18.8	6	9.4	0	0.0	6	9.4
Western	11	12.2	2	2.2	2	2.2	16	17.8
New York City	3	11.1	1	3.7	0	0.0	4	14.8
Total State	121	16.7%	55	7.6%	11	1.5%	103	14.2%

(Concluded)

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Administering:							
	Nelson-Denny Reading		SRA Reading Record		Other Test(s)		No Standardized Reading Achievement Test	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	12	12.6%	10	10.5%	59	62.1%	11	11.6%
Central	5	10.4	3	6.3	38	79.2	2	4.2
Central Western	9	13.2	11	16.2	47	69.1	6	8.8
Lower Hudson	12	21.1	9	15.8	40	70.2	2	3.5
Mid-Hudson	11	25.0	5	11.4	24	54.5	9	20.5
Mohawk	4	10.0	3	7.5	22	55.0	5	12.5
Nassau	8	14.5	4	7.3	32	58.2	1	1.8
Northeast	3	10.3	2	6.9	18	62.1	8	27.6
Ontario	6	17.6	5	14.7	17	50.0	8	23.5
Southern Tier	17	22.7	2	2.7	49	65.3	9	12.0
Suffolk	2	3.1	2	3.1	39	60.9	7	10.9
Western	19	21.1	11	12.2	65	72.2	8	8.9
New York City	0	0.0	7	25.9	25	92.6	0	0.0
Total State	108	14.9%	74	10.2%	475	65.4%	76	10.5%

TABLE 25A

ADMINISTRATION OF STANDARDIZED READING ACHIEVEMENT TESTS
DURING THE FIRST SEMESTER (SEPTEMBER - JANUARY) OF THE SCHOOL YEAR,
BY GRADE LEVEL, SECONDARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Administering Tests to:													
	Seventh Grade		Eighth Grade		Ninth Grade		Tenth Grade		Eleventh Grade		Twelfth Grade		Ungraded Secondary (Handicapped)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	41	43.2%	41	43.2%	45	47.4%	32	33.7%	29	30.5%	16	16.8%	8	8.4%
Central	32	66.7	30	62.5	34	70.8	26	54.2	21	43.8	18	37.5	4	8.3
Central Western	32	47.1	33	48.5	25	36.8	17	25.0	11	16.2	9	13.2	5	7.4
Lower Hudson	25	43.9	21	36.8	21	36.8	17	29.8	13	22.8	6	10.5	6	10.5
Mid-Hudson	17	38.6	14	31.8	21	47.7	14	31.8	10	22.7	8	18.2	7	15.9
Mohawk	20	50.0	20	50.0	23	57.5	14	35.0	12	30.0	12	30.0	0	0.0
Nassau	22	40.0	21	38.2	20	36.4	22	40.0	14	25.5	8	14.5	3	5.5
Northeast	11	37.9	10	34.5	10	34.5	7	24.1	8	27.6	6	20.7	4	13.8
Ontario	20	58.8	17	50.0	14	41.2	15	44.1	11	32.4	9	26.5	3	8.8
Southern Tier	40	53.3	39	52.0	33	44.0	28	37.3	23	30.7	21	28.0	4	5.3
Suffolk	31	48.4	24	37.5	25	39.1	11	17.2	7	10.9	5	7.8	2	3.1
Western	53	58.9	46	51.1	45	50.0	27	30.0	24	26.7	19	21.1	6	6.7
New York City	8	29.6	8	29.6	9	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	18.5
Total State	352	48.5%	324	44.6%	325	44.8%	230	31.7%	183	25.2%	137	18.9%	57	7.9%

TABLE 25B

ADMINISTRATION OF STANDARDIZED READING ACHIEVEMENT TESTS
DURING THE SECOND SEMESTER (FEBRUARY - JUNE) OF THE SCHOOL YEAR,
BY GRADE LEVEL, SECONDARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Administering Tests to:													
	Seventh Grade		Eighth Grade		Ninth Grade		Tenth Grade		Eleventh Grade		Twelfth Grade		Ungraded Secondary (Handicapped)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	45	47.4%	47	49.5%	27	28.4%	25	26.3%	20	21.1%	17	17.9%	5	5.3%
Central	27	56.3	28	58.3	24	50.0	21	43.8	19	39.6	15	31.3	4	8.3
Central Western	43	63.2	45	66.2	27	39.7	17	25.0	16	23.5	14	20.6	6	8.8
Lower Hudson	31	54.4	30	52.6	27	47.4	17	29.8	14	24.6	8	14.0	7	12.3
Mid-Hudson	19	43.2	17	38.6	15	34.1	11	25.0	8	18.2	6	13.6	6	13.6
Mohawk	17	42.5	17	42.5	15	37.5	15	37.5	12	30.0	10	25.0	0	0.0
Nassau	27	49.1	28	50.9	19	34.5	11	20.0	10	18.2	8	14.5	3	5.5
Northeast	12	41.4	13	44.8	6	20.7	3	10.3	2	6.9	3	10.3	3	10.3
Ontario	17	50.0	17	50.0	13	38.2	10	29.4	9	26.5	6	17.6	1	2.9
Southern Tier	45	60.0	46	61.3	33	44.0	32	42.7	26	34.7	24	32.0	4	5.3
Suffolk	27	42.2	28	43.8	25	39.1	18	28.1	14	21.9	9	14.1	2	3.1
Western	56	62.2	52	57.8	41	45.6	36	40.0	34	37.8	25	27.8	6	6.7
New York City	20	74.1	20	74.1	20	74.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	18.5
Total State	386	53.2%	388	53.4%	292	40.2%	216	29.8%	184	25.3%	145	20.0%	52	7.2%

TABLE 26

USE OF RESULTS OF STANDARDIZED READING ACHIEVEMENT TESTS, SECONDARY PROGRAMS

BOCES REGIONS, NEW YORK CITY, AND TOTAL STATE

1975-76

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using Results For:							
	Criteria For Grouping Students		Criteria For Differentiating Instruction		Criteria For Selection and Use of Materials		Criteria For Selection of Students For Special Programs	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	47	49.5%	51	53.7%	45	47.4%	57	60.0%
Central	31	64.6	36	75.0	37	77.1	39	81.3
Central Western	38	55.9	45	66.2	40	58.8	57	83.8
Lower Hudson	31	54.4	44	77.2	37	64.9	39	68.4
Mid-Hudson	24	54.5	27	61.4	24	54.5	26	59.1
Mohawk	18	45.0	21	52.5	20	50.0	27	67.5
Nassau	33	60.0	34	61.8	31	56.4	37	67.3
Northeast	14	48.3	16	55.2	14	48.3	15	51.7
Ontario	13	38.2	18	52.9	17	50.0	20	58.8
Southern Tier	40	53.3	47	62.7	48	64.0	52	69.3
Suffolk	34	53.1	38	59.4	37	57.8	42	65.6
Western	54	60.0	59	65.6	48	53.3	70	77.8
New York City	25	92.6	21	77.8	23	85.2	25	92.6
Total State	402	55.4%	457	62.9%	421	58.0%	506	69.7%

(Concluded)

Region	Number and Percent of Districts Using Results For:							
	Criteria For Placement of Students in Selected Curriculum Strands		Factor in Counseling Students		Material For Individual Student Files		Other Purposes	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Capital District	33	34.7%	60	63.2%	61	64.2%	11	11.6%
Central	20	41.7	36	75.0	37	77.1	5	10.4
Central Western	34	50.0	44	64.7	56	82.4	7	10.3
Lower Hudson	20	35.1	42	73.7	46	80.7	7	12.3
Mid-Hudson	22	50.0	26	59.1	25	56.8	2	4.5
Mohawk	13	32.5	28	70.0	24	60.0	1	2.5
Nassau	27	49.1	41	74.5	36	65.5	8	14.5
Northeast	9	31.0	16	55.2	14	48.3	3	10.3
Ontario	10	29.4	20	58.8	23	67.6	5	14.7
Southern Tier	27	36.0	52	69.3	45	60.0	10	13.3
Suffolk	25	39.1	37	57.8	43	67.2	6	9.4
Western	40	44.4	61	67.8	58	64.4	7	7.8
New York City	20	74.1	19	70.4	20	74.1	1	3.7
Total State	300	41.3%	482	66.4%	488	67.2%	73	10.1%

DIRECTORY OF BOCES REGIONAL AREAS